DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 286 881 SP 029 488

AUTHOR Brophy, Jere; Rohrkemper, Mary
TITLE Teachers' Strategies for Coping with Hostile-Aggressive Students. R.S. 185.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Inst. for Research on Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Oct 87
NOTE 96p.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University, 252 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Aggression; *Classroom Techniques; *Discipline Problems; Elementary Education; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Response

ABSTRACT

Experienced elementary (K-6) teachers nominated by their principals as either outstanding or average at dealing with problem students described their general strategies for coping with hostile-aggressive students and told how they would handle incidents depicted in two vignettes portraying aggression at school. Transcripts of these responses were coded and analyzed for general trends and group differences. The higher rated teachers were more confident of their abilities to improve the behavior of aggressive students, and they gave more organized and detailed descriptions of their strategies for doing so. Their responses combined firmness in putting a stop to aggression and requiring aggressive students to assume responsibility for their behavior and its consequences with attempts to resocialize these students' attitudes and beliefs or to instruct them in better ways of coping with frustration and conflict. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

R.S. 185

TEACHERS' STRATEGIES FOR COPING WITH HOSTILE-AGGRESSIVE STUDENTS

Jere Brophy and
Mary Rohrkemper

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Brophy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

R.S. 185

TEACHERS' STRATEGIES FOR COPING WITH HOSTILE-AGGRESSIVE STUDENTS

Jere Brophy and
Mary Rohrkemper

Published By

The Institute for Research on Teaching
College of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034

October 1987

This work is sponsored in part by the Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University. The Institute for Research on Teaching is funded from a variety of federal, state, and private sources including the United States Department of Education and Michigan State University. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the funding agencies.

Institute for Research on Teaching

The **Institute for Research on Teaching** was founded at Michigan State University (MSU) in 1976 by the National Institute of Education. Following a nationwide competition in 1981, the NIE awarded a second five-year contract to MSU. Funding is currently received from the U.S. Department of Education, Michigan State University, and other agencies and foundations for individual research projects.

The IRT conducts major research projects aimed at improving classroom teaching, including studies of classroom management strategies, student socialization, the diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties, and teacher education. IRT researchers are also examining the teaching of specific school subjects such as reading, writing, general mathematics, and science and are seeking to understand how factors outside the classroom affect teacher decision making.

Researchers from such diverse disciplines as educational psychology, anthropology, sociology, and philosophy cooperate in conducting IRT research. They join forces with public school teachers who work at the IRT as half-time collaborators in research, helping to design and plan studies, collect data, analyze and interpret results, and disseminate findings.

The IRT publishes research reports, occasional papers, conference proceedings, a newsletter for practitioners, and lists and catalogs of IRT publications. For more information, to receive a list or catalog, and/or to be placed on the IRT mailing list to receive the newsletter, please write to the IRT Editor, Institute for Research on Teaching, 252 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034.

Co-Directors: Jere E. Brophy and Andrew C. Porter

Editor: Sandra Gross

Abstract

Experienced elementary (K-6) teachers nominated by their principals as either outstanding or average at dealing with problem students described their general strategies for coping with hostile-aggressive students and told how they would handle incidents depicted in two vignettes portraying aggression at school. Transcripts of these responses were coded and analyzed for general trends and group differences. The higher rated teachers were more confident of their abilities to improve the behavior of aggressive students, and they gave more organized and detailed descriptions of their strategies for doing so. Their responses combined firmness in putting a stop to aggression and requiring aggressive students to assume responsibility for their behavior and its consequences with attempts to resocialize these students' attitudes and beliefs or to instruct them in better ways of coping with frustration and conflict.

TEACHERS' STRATEGIES FOR COPING WITH HOSTILE-AGGRESSIVE STUDENTS

Jere Brophy and Mary Rohrkemper[1]

Research on classroom management (reviewed in Brophy, 1983, and Doyle, 1986) has yielded a well-integrated and replicated data base concerning effective handling of basic classroom management tasks such as establishing rules, daily routines, and work accountability systems, handling transitions between activities, and maintaining student attention to lessons and engagement in assignments. At this point, a great deal is known about managing classrooms effectively. Much less is known, however, about effective teacher strategies for coping with students who are aggressive, defiant, withdrawn, or otherwise difficult to handle because of chronic personality or behavioral disturbances. General classroom management strategies that are effective with the class as a whole are also effective (as far as they go) with such problem students, but these students also need more individualized and personalized treatment from their teachers.

It is possible to glean from diverse sources (the literatures on childrearing in the home, cognitive behavior modification, strategy training, social skills training, and psychotherapy) a set of principles that reflect a consensus of expert opinion and can be integrated into an internally

---

Jere Brophy is coordinator of the Classroom Strategy Research Project and is a Professor of Teacher Education at Michigan State University. Mary Rohrkemper, former IRT intern with the project, is assistant professor in the Department of Human Development at Bryn Mawr College. The authors wish to thank Jane Smith, Janis Elmore, Carolyn Rettke, Jean Medick, Lonnie McIntyre, Susan Rubenstein, Stephen Katz, and JoAnn Hite who assisted in project planning and data collection, and Jane Smith, Lynn Scott, Patricia Linton, Carolyn Wainright, Linda Ripley, and Sheba Dunlap who coded the data, Suwatana Sookpokakit, Neelam Kher, and Frank Jenkins who assisted with data preparation and analysis, and June Smith who assisted in manuscript preparation.

consistent and systematic approach to dealing with problem students (Brophy, 1983, 1985; Good & Brophy, 1986a, 1987). Except for certain applications of behavior modification principles, however, there has been little systematic research on applications of these principles in the classroom, and the research that is available is mostly inconclusive (Emmer & Aussiker, 1987). Thus, there is need for information about methods for dealing with problem students, especially methods that are feasible and effective for use by ordinary classroom teachers (i.e., not school psychologists, social workers, or other specialists).

This report provides information about elementary grade (K-6) teachers' reported strategies for coping with chronically hostile-aggressive students. This is one of 12 types of problem student addressed in the Classroom Strategy Study (Brophy & Rohrkemper, in press), a large-scale investigation of elementary school teachers' perceptions of and reported strategies for coping with problem students (students who present chronic problems involving unsatisfactory achievement, personal adjustment, or classroom behavior). Information about strategies for coping with the other 11 problem student types (underachiever due to low self-concept/failure syndrome, underachiever due to perfectionism, underachiever due to alienation, low achiever, passive-aggressive, defiant, hyperactive, distractible, immature, shy/withdrawn, and rejected by peers) will be given in other reports currently in preparation.

Hostile-Aggressive Students

Hostility and aggression against peers are among the most serious problems confronting teachers, and also among the most difficult to handle effectively. Physical attacks, bullying, fights, and arguments not only disrupt the academic focus of the classroom but also threaten the physical

safety and psychological security of everyone in the class. School administrators and teachers simply cannot allow aggression to become commonplace if they expect their schools to remain viable as educational institutions; in fact, establishment and preservation of a physically safe environment is one of the factors that consistently shows up in studies of school effectiveness, especially in urban schools (Good & Brophy, 1986b).

Hostility and aggression problems are especially serious from the perspective of concern about the adjustment of the hostile-aggressive student and the welfare of society generally. Once established, antisocial and aggressive patterns of behavior tend to persist. Longitudinal studies indicate that, compared to almost any other group of disturbed children, hostile-aggressive children are more likely to become maladjusted adults (Loeber, 1982; Olweus, 1979; Robins, 1966). Generalized patterns of hostile-aggressive response to frustration and conflict develop gradually but become increasingly self-sustaining as they become more entrenched.

These factors that make stable and generalized hostile-aggressive behavior so serious also make it difficult for teachers to deal with. Unlike situation-specific behaviors, generalized aggression cannot be eliminated simply by seeing that aggressive students are kept out of a few troublesome situations or are taught to handle those situations more effectively. Unlike reactive responses to specific events (parental separation, displacement by a newborn sibling, etc.), the problem cannot be expected to disappear gradually "on its own" as the child learns to accept and cope with the source of stress. Unlike transient developmental phenomena, children do not "grow out of" generalized antisocial aggression in a few months or years.

Another reason why hostile-aggressive students are especially difficult for teachers to deal with is that teachers are constantly clashing with these

students in their roles as authority figures responsible for maintaining order in the classroom. Teachers can often ignore or make allowances for other types of problem behavior, but they must intervene and put a stop to aggression immediately and often must punish aggressors or refer them to the principal for disciplinary action. This makes it difficult for teachers to develop positive relationships with such students, especially if the students resist authority figures in addition to being aggressive toward their peers.

Finally, generalized patterns of hostility and aggression usually develop primarily in response to events occurring in and around the home rather than in response to the behavior of the teacher or to events occurring in the classroom. Teachers' opportunities to affect these home factors are limited, so they have to concentrate on keeping the problem under reasonable control at school rather than on solving the problem in a more basic and generalized way.

Causes of Aggression

Traditionally, aggressive children have been pictured as frustrated and angry individuals who have learned to "take it out on" others. Early theorizing concentrated on deprivation or other frustration that made them angry in the first place. Psychoanalytically oriented writers usually stressed emotional dynamics (rejection by one or both parents) or frustrating events (displacement by a newborn sibling) occurring in the family. Early social learning theorists called attention to a broader range of potential causes, both generalized (social rejection due to physical unattractiveness; humiliation due to persistent school failure) and specific (being attacked or insulted; losing a competition). Across these and other formulations of the problem, common threads included the notions that some sort of deprivation or frustration induced rage, which in turn led the individual to retaliate,

either directly (if possible) or against some substitute object (human, animal, or inanimate). In theory, the build-up of rage would act as a drive predisposing the person to "act it out" or "express" it, and leaving the person in a state of increasingly intolerable tension until he or she did so. Acting out would induce tension release or catharsis, allowing the person to calm down and resume a more normal mode of functioning.

There are several problems with this formulation. For one, there are great individual differences in response to frustration. Some people respond with disappointment or depression rather than anger or with a relatively unemotional attempt to analyze what went wrong and how it can be remediated. Furthermore, only some of those who do develop anger will develop intense rage, and only some of those experiencing intense rage will become aggressive. Another problem is that experiments have shown that, contrary to the catharsis hypothesis, aggression against substitute objects tends to increase rather than decrease the individual's subsequent rate of aggressive behavior (Bandura, 1973; Roedell, Slaby, & Robinson, 1976). Instead of helping aggressive students learn to respond more maturely to frustration, encouraging them to act out their anger against substitute objects (a) reinforces the idea that extreme anger is an expected and "normal" response to frustration; (b) reinforces the expectation that whenever they have angry feelings they will need to act them out behaviorally; and (c) provides an inappropriate model for the rest of the class, increasing the likelihood that the problem will spread to them, too.

As Good and Brophy (1987) explain:

> The problem is that the connection "I need to act out angry feelings--I can release them through catharsis" is merely the end point in a chain of reactions. The connections "frustration--angry feelings" and "angry feelings--act out" precede the cathartic end

> point. Every time the end point of the chain is reinforced, the whole chain that led up to it is reinforced. The student is reinforced not only for expressing extreme anger harmlessly, but also for building up extreme anger in the first place and for believing that this emotion requires or justifies aggressive behavior. (p. 283)

Investigation of why only certain individuals develop generalized patterns of aggressive response to frustration led to a search for additional factors besides frustration itself that might explain hostile-aggressive behavior patterns. One such factor is modeling, particularly by the parents. It is well known that a large proportion of aggressive individuals come from strife-ridden homes in which the parents are aggressive toward each other (or one is aggressive and the other passive) and the children are frequently treated with hostility, abuse, and physical punishment. As Bandura (1973) and others have pointed out, children growing up in such homes not only suffer frustration and deprivation but are continually exposed to the modeling of aggression as "normal" behavior. Such children are likely to become hostile and aggressive themselves, especially if they are not consistently exposed to better alternatives (by a parent or other significant individual in their lives who consistently preaches and practices more mature responses to frustration and more effective methods for resolving conflicts).

The consequences of aggression are also important. One factor is the response of adult socializers. Even where aggression is seldom if ever modeled in the home, most children will exhibit at least some aggression in their interactions with peers. If adults observe such aggression and express their disapproval of it, its frequency is likely to decrease. However, its frequency is likely to increase if adults should approve of it. The same is true even if the adults should merely observe without disapproving overtly, because children will tend to respond to lack of overt disapproval in these situations as if it were approval (Berkowitz, 1973).

Another factor, and perhaps the most important, is the degree to which the child is reinforced (or at least, passively allowed to enjoy reinforcement) for aggressive actions. Children who have learned to enjoy or profit from aggression (because they gain some material advantage, take something away from a peer, or just enjoy making the peer cry or run away) are likely to continue such behavior unless adults intervene to prevent it or change the reinforcement contingencies that sustain it (Patterson, Littman, & Bricker, 1967).

Patterson (1982) found that all of these causes are usually present in the backgrounds of extremely antisocial children. Even in cases where the parents are not particularly rejecting or hostile and aggressive themselves, child rearing tends to be marked by poor monitoring of the child's activities and inadequate or inconsistent discipline. The parents often come to expect and in effect accept aggressive behavior from their child and often unwittingly encourage progress toward a generalized aggressive pattern by labeling the child as deviant (e.g., as hot tempered, a bully, etc.).

In summary, children who develop generalized patterns of hostile, antisocial, and aggressive behavior tend to come from homes where similar emotions and behavior are modeled by at least one parent. Also, such children tend to be "undersocialized"--poorly monitored and inconsistently or otherwise inadequately disciplined--so that their aggressive behavior is allowed and reinforced rather than replaced with more socially acceptable methods of meeting needs and solving conflicts. If such behavior patterns are allowed to become well established, and especially if the child is labeled as deviant, they can become very difficult to change.

Suggested Strategies for Coping with Aggression

Several authors have suggested guidelines for teachers concerning coping with aggressive students in the classroom. Most of these involve attempts to resocialize attitudes and beliefs that support antisocial aggression or to change behavior through applied behavior analysis or cognitive behavior modification techniques.

Roedell, Slaby, and Robinson (1976) suggest modeling, and creating the expectation that the students also will exhibit, a reasoned, cooperative, nonaggressive approach to solving social conflicts; attending to and reinforcing cooperative statements and behavior; teaching the class in general and aggressive students in particular how to solve conflicts verbally and cooperatively; attending primarily to the victim rather than to the aggressor following aggressive acts, and making sure that the aggressor does not benefit from such acts; teaching potential victims assertive but not aggressive strategies for discouraging aggression against them; and avoiding physically punishing aggressive students or encouraging them to achieve catharsis by acting out aggression against inanimate objects.

Good and Brophy (1987) stress the need to make it clear that aggressive behavior will not be tolerated, while at the same time showing a willingness to try to help aggressive students by listening to them sympathetically, attempting to resocialize their beliefs and attitudes through modeling and persuasion, and teaching them more effective ways of interacting with others and solving conflicts. In particular, they stress helping such students to distinguish emotional reactions from behavior (not all anger is justified; and even justified anger does not legitimize physical aggression), avoiding labeling them as deviant, and finding ways for them to interact prosocially and cooperatively with peers.

Various investigators have reported that aggressive children are paranoid--prone to jump to unjustified conclusions about the intentions behind the behavior of others and in particular to interpret neutral or even prosocial behavior of peers as antisocial or aggressive in intent (Dodge & Frame, 1982; Dodge, Murphy, & Buchsbaum, 1984; Dodge, Pettit, McClaskey, & Brown, 1986). Furthermore, once they interpret hostile intent on the part of a peer, they are more likely than other children to respond aggressively rather than with more neutral or prosocial behavior. Finally, they tend to be unrepentant for such behavior, relying on defense mechanisms that depersonalize blame, rationalize their own actions or even blame the victim (McCuller & Moseby, 1983; Millon, 1981; Redl & Wineman, 1951). Good and Brophy (1987) stress the need to combat aggressive students' tendencies toward egocentrism and paranoia in their social perceptions and to develop in them a habit of testing such perceptions before acting on them.

Direct socialization based on appeal to reason would seem to be a particularly relevant strategy for dealing with aggressive children, but it has not received much systematic study. However, Zahavi and Asher (1978) reported a reduction in aggression and an increase in cooperation among aggressive preschool children who were instructed about the harm that results from aggression, its ineffectiveness as an interpersonal strategy, and the value of constructive alternatives such as cooperation and sharing.

The applied behavior analysis approach calls for determining whether a problem represents a behavioral deficit or a behavioral excess and then using techniques for either increasing or decreasing relevant behaviors. Traditionally, aggression has been conceptualized as a problem of behavioral excess, and behavioristic writers have advocated such approaches as stating

clear limits and prohibitions on unacceptable behavior, reinforcing students when they behave acceptably but withholding reinforcement when they do not, using response-contingent time out or social isolation procedures to prevent the students from deriving satisfaction or reinforcement from their aggressive acts and using response cost (punishment) procedures if necessary (Herbert, 1978; O'Leary & O'Leary, 1977; Ross, 1981). Time out procedures are believed to be especially effective because they deprive the aggressive student of the natural reinforcing consequences (peer attention or envy, material advantages gained, adult anger or attention, etc.) that are known or believed to occur following aggressive actions.

More recently, behavioristic writers (especially those who stress cognitive behavior modification approaches) have begun to develop treatment strategies based on the notion that aggression involves deficits in addition to behavioral excesses. These deficits are more cognitive than behavioral, but they have behavioral consequences. Aggressive students frequently fail to analyze social situations long or objectively enough to develop accurate perceptions, so they are prone to jump to erroneous conclusions about what others are doing or thinking and then to act on those conclusions in aggressive ways. Thus, they show basic attentional and information-processing deficits. In addition, they often show developmental lags or deficits in basic social knowledge and skills: They often rely on immature social interaction and problem-solving methods because they are unaware of more mature methods (or at least, have not yet mastered those methods sufficiently to be able to use them routinely). Finally, they are often unaware of their own behavior, how it is perceived by others, and the effects that it has on others. Several techniques have been developed to address these cognitive

deficits (Camp, Blom, Herbert, & Van Doorninck, 1977; Goodwin & Mahoney, 1975; Kennedy, 1982; Kettlewell & Kausch, 1983; Novaco, 1975; Robin, Schneider, & Dolnick, 1976; Schloss, 1983; Stewart & Ashby, 1981; Urbain & Kendall, 1980).

Some are quite imaginative. Novaco (1975), for example, uses cognitive restructuring (teaching the person to view stressful situations in more productive ways), self instruction, and problem-solving techniques to "innoculate" aggressive individuals against stress and equip them with better coping mechanisms. In this method, the counselor helps the individual to consider hypothetical stressful situations and generate self-instructions for (a) preparing for possible provocations; (b) dealing with the impact and confrontation; (c) coping with emotional arousal; and (d) reflecting on the experience subsequently. Throughout the training the individual is taught to retain control over behavior through cognitive self-instruction (self-talk).

Robin, Schneider, and Dolnick (1976) developed the "turtle technique" for helping angry children to control their emotions and behavior. These children were taught to imagine themselves as turtles who go into their shells instead of lashing out when angry. They learned to sit down and place their heads in their arms, to relax physically and allow themselves time to calm down, and to think of nonaggressive ways to respond to the situation.

Camp et al. (1977) developed the "Think Aloud" program for aggressive elementary school boys, combining techniques taken from Spivack and Shure's (1974) problem-solving training program and ideas develped by Meichenbaum (1977) and others for using modeling and verbalized self-instructions to improve control over behavior. The children were taught to think about four basic questions in developing responses to problems: What is my problem? What is my plan? Am I using my plan? How did I do?

These and other cognitive behavior modification approaches appear to be among the most promising methods for dealing with aggressive students, but they have been developed only recently and have not yet been disseminated effectively to teachers. Consequently, although some of the teachers we interviewed were intuitively using some of the principles that underlie these treatment approaches, none had received training in them or used them systematically (in fact, none mentioned cognitive behavior modification or any of the authors or programs referenced in recent paragraphs).

Classroom Strategy Study: Design and Data Collection Procedures

The Classroom Strategy Study was not an experiment, but a systematic gathering of self-report data from experienced elementary teachers who varied in grade level, types of students taught, and rated skill at dealing with problem students. Teachers who had been nominated by their principals as either outstanding or average in ability to cope with problem students responded to interviews and vignettes designed to elicit their attitudes and beliefs about 12 types of problem student and their strategies for coping with the problems that each type presents. Responses were transcribed and coded, yielding scores reflecting the teachers' reported beliefs, attitudes, expectations, and coping strategies. The scores then were analyzed to yield two general types of information: descriptive data indicating the frequency of each response in the sample of teachers as a whole and in subsamples differing by grade level and geographic location; and correlational data indicating relationships between interview or vignette responses and ratings of the teachers' effectiveness in coping with problem students. Taken together, these data describe the strategies currently used by teachers for coping with problem students in their classes and provide suggestive

(correlational) information about the relative effectiveness of these strategies.

Source and Nature of Data

The teachers were presented with descriptions of key personal characteristics and behaviors of commonly encountered problem student types and with vignettes depicting incidents of the troublesome behavior that such students present. The teachers were asked to describe their general strategies for responding to each type of problem student and their specific strategies for responding to the incidents depicted in the vignettes.

The data are self-reported and thus open to memory failure and distortion, social desirability responding, and all of the other threats to reliability and validity that are involved in asking people to report on their own behavior (Ericcson & Simon, 1980; Nisbett & Wilson, 1977). However, several features were built into the study to guard against such problems. First, experienced teachers were asked about familiar aspects of their work that usually had involved some prior conscious thinking and decision making. Second, the teachers were asked open-ended questions and encouraged to speak at length in their own words (rather than to choose among fixed alternatives). Self-report data tend to be largely accurate when people are asked about familiar matters that they have experienced and thought about and when they are allowed to respond in their own words (Ericcson & Simon, 1980; Shavelson & Stern, 1981). Finally, the teachers were asked first to describe their strategies ("what they would say and do") and second to discuss "why" they would respond in this way. Thus, the interview structure encouraged them to disentangle their responses to students from their rationales and justifications for those responses. This procedure likely enhances the validity of the self-report of strategies (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977).

The Teachers

All teachers interviewed were regular classroom teachers (i.e., not resource room teachers or other specialists) with at least three years of experience. Most taught in self-contained age-graded classrooms, although a few taught in team teaching or semi-departmentalized arrangements.

Of the 98 teachers, 54 taught in the public schools of a small city, and 44 in the inner-city public schools of one of the nation's largest cities. Both cities are in the midwest (they will be referred to as Small City and Big City). Small City's schools are representative in many ways of the schools in the nation at large. Major employers in the area include the state government, a major university, and several automobile parts and assembly plants, so Small City has a diversified economy that provides a variety of white collar and blue collar jobs. The majority (over 60%) of its students are Anglos, but there are significant black (25%) and Hispanic (10%) minorities, as well as smaller percentages of Asians and Native Americans. Many of the minority students attended naturally integrated schools, although some were bused from areas of concentrated minority residence to schools in predominantly Anglo neighborhoods.

Small City does not contain an extensive economically depressed area, so that it does not have "inner-city schools." Yet, the need for information about coping with problem students appears to be greatest at such schools, and it is possible that the strategies that work most effectively in inner-city schools differ from the strategies that work best elsewhere. These considerations led us to include the inner-city schools of Big City as a second site for data collection. Within Big City, we worked in three districts that served the most economically depressed inner-city areas. The

vast majority of students attending these schools were from black families, and most were poor. Readers should bear in mind that, although we refer to the "Big City" subsample when reporting results, this subsample was confined to inner-city schools and thus is not representative of the Big City school system as a whole.

In summary, the 98 teachers included 54 in Small City and 44 in the inner-city schools of Big City. The Small City subsample contained 28 teachers in the lower grades (K-3) and 26 in the upper grades (4-6), of whom 7 were male and 47 were female. The Big City subsample included 22 teachers in the lower grades and 22 in the upper grades, of whom 10 were male and 34 were female. All 50 of the teachers in the lower grades were female; 17 of the 48 in the upper grades were male. Information about grade level, location, and gender differences in teachers' responses to our interview questions and vignettes is given in Brophy and Rohrkemper (in press).

Effectiveness Ratings

Ratings of the effectiveness of teachers in coping with problem students were obtained from principals and from classroom observers. Principals' ratings were collected in the process of identifying appropriate teachers for potential involvement in the study. Principals were informed about the nature of the study and told that we wished to interview teachers who had at least three years of experience and fit one of the following descriptions.

A. Outstanding teacher(s)

> Do you have a teacher whom you consider to be truly outstanding in effectively handling difficult students--minimizing their problem behavior and responding to it effectively when it does occur? Please note the name of this teacher below (Note another if you believe that more than one teacher at your school is truly outstanding in this regard, but bear in mind that we seek to identify the top 10% or so of these teachers).

B. Other Experienced Teacher(s)

> For each "outstanding" teacher included in the study, we want to include another teacher with at least three years of experience who is not as outstanding in effectiveness in dealing with the 12 types of problem students that we have identified for focus. We do not seek teachers who are overwhelmed with problems and cannot cope with difficult students. Instead, we seek the 80% or so of teachers who are neither outstanding nor notably ineffective in this regard--teachers who maintain satisfactory classroom control and who usually can cope with the problems that difficult students present, even though they are not as outstanding as the teacher(s) named above. Teachers who teach at the same grade level as the teacher(s) named above are especially desirable.

Note that the questions called for principals to judge teachers on their general effectiveness in dealing with problem students, rather than to rate their effectiveness with each of the 12 types separately. We would have preferred 12 separate ratings, but pilot interviews revealed that principals could not make such ratings validly, even though they did have general impressions of teachers' success in handling problem students.

We excluded principals who were in the first year at their present schools and thus had not had much time to gather information about their teachers. Even so, some principals had much more information than others, because of differences in length of contact with their teachers or in frequency and purpose of classroom visits and faculty meetings. Most principals appeared to have little direct (observational) knowledge of teachers' strategies and to judge teachers according to general impressions gleaned from personal interactions with them, the frequency and nature of their disciplinary referrals, and their reputations with other teachers and with students and their parents.

We believe that most principals rated teachers primarily on their success in handling disruptive, aggressive, and defiant students and that they placed more emphasis on their success in containing these students' undesirable

behavior than on their success in developing more desirable behavior patterns. This is understandable in view of the limited information that most principals have available to them and the fact that maintaining safety and discipline in the school is one of their primary responsibilities.

The teachers were recruited volunteers who were paid a modest honorarium in partial compensation for their out-of-class time spent responding to interviews and vignettes. During recruitment they were informed about the purpose and methodology of the study, but not about their principals having rated them as either outstanding or average in coping with problem students. Since there were more comparison teachers than "outstanding" teachers, the recruiting strategy was first to obtain a commitment to participate from an "outstanding" teacher and then to recruit a comparison teacher working under similar conditions (ideally, in the same grade level at the same school). The teachers were informed that they would be visited for two half-days in their classrooms (to allow us to observe them in action and see what the students and the daily routine were like) and then interviewed during private meetings.

Recruited teachers were assigned to an observer/interviewer for data collection. These individuals were well acquainted with the purpose and design of the study, but they never knew whether the teachers they observed and interviewed had been designated as outstanding or as average by their principals. Consequently, they were in position to give ratings of the teachers that would be independent of the principals' ratings, and were asked to rate the teachers on the following scale.

> Teacher's group designation. Based on information from the principal, each teacher has been designated as being either outstanding or average at dealing with problem students. Into which group do you think this teacher is nominated?

5. I am confident that this teacher is in the outstanding group.
4. I think that this teacher is probably in the outstanding group.
3. I cannot decide.
2. I think that this teacher is probably in the average group.
1. I am confident that this teacher is in the average group.

The observers' ratings were made after two half-days in the classroom but prior to the interviews, so they were based on what they saw of the teachers interacting with their students rather than on what the teachers said about coping with problem students.

We had anticipated positive but only moderate correlations between the principals' and the observers' ratings, because teacher effectiveness in coping with problem students is complex and difficult to rate and because neither group of raters was working from a detailed information base (especially not the observers). However, the correlation between the two sets of ratings was even lower than expected (r = .11). Analyses of the relationships between these two sets of ratings and other measures developed in the study (Brophy & Rohrkemper, in press) suggested that the principals' ratings were based primarily on the teachers' reputations for successfully managing their classes and controlling student behavior (especially disruptive and aggressive behavior), whereas the observers' ratings placed more emphasis on the teachers' success in creating a positive classroom atmosphere and obtaining willing compliance from their students. The two sets of ratings appear to convey reliable (but different) information, but the principals' ratings appear somewhat more focused on teachers' success in dealing with problem students.

Data Collection

Teachers were interviewed at times and places of their convenience. Interviews averaged three to four hours each, spread over at least two

sessions. Interviews were audiotaped so that teachers' verbatim responses to questions were preserved for later transcription and coding.

Teachers were allowed to respond to questions in their own words. If they asked for clarification, or if they were not addressing the questions asked, the interviewer would repeat or rephrase the question. Once teachers had made their initial free responses to questions without interruption, interviewers probed to clarify ambiguous points, address questions that had been omitted, or stimulate the teacher to elaborate on matters that had not been explained fully. Probing was confined to such clarification and elaboration questions, however; interviewers did not ask teachers about matters that they did not bring up themselves.

Interviewing began with the vignettes, which had been constructed to depict behaviors typical of each of the 12 problem student types, described so that the depicted events would seem familiar and realistic to the teachers. The problem behavior was described as sufficiently troublesome that most teachers would feel compelled to take immediate action in response to it and as characteristic of the student rather than as an isolated event. In other words, the vignettes made it clear that the depicted incidents were parts of larger, chronic behavior patterns. To ensure that all teachers could easily imagine the incidents as occurring in their classrooms, we restricted the depicted problems to those judged likely to occur within the K-6 grade level range and eliminated all references to student age, geographical location, or other context factors that might not apply to certain teachers. Also, the students in the vignettes, although identified by gender (through their names) and by the nature of their chronic behavior problems, were not identified by race, social class, or other status characteristics.

The identification of students by name (and thus by gender) was not done as part of a systematic attempt to include gender of the problem student as an independent variable (this would have required many more vignettes per teacher). Instead, the names were included because pilot work had revealed that this was necessary for realism. Teachers found it easy and natural to talk about "Tom" or "Mary," but not about someone known only as "a student."

There were two vignettes for each problem student type (rather than just one) because we wanted to see if teachers' responses to a particular type of problem behavior would differ according to the specifics of the situation. Thus, the two vignettes in each pair depicted the same general type of problem behavior but differed in the context in which the behavior appeared and in the particular nature of the behavior itself. We would have preferred to have several vignettes for each problem type, but financial constraints limited us to two. Names (and thus, gender designations) were assigned according to the base rates of the problem behavior. Male names were assigned to both of the hostile-aggressive vignettes, because overt hostile-aggressive behavior is encountered much more frequently in boys than in girls.

We anticipated that the interviews would elicit general and proactive (planned and initiated by the teachers themselves) strategies for dealing with problem students, whereas the vignettes would elicit descriptions of how the teachers would react to unplanned (and undesirable) behavior that occurred in specific situations. To simulate situations in which unexpected events occur that require immediate response, we required the teachers to respond to the vignettes "cold," without having had a chance to think about them or make notes beforehand. The vignettes were printed on separate sheets and presented one at a time. The instructions were as follows:

This is a series of vignettes depicting classroom events involving problem students. Read each vignette and tell me what you would say and do in the immediate situation if you were the teacher. After telling me what you would say and do, you can elaborate by explaining your goals, the rationale for your goals and behavior, or any other details that you might wish to add.

Following completion of the vignettes, the teachers were given descriptions of the 12 problem student types and told that they would be interviewed a week or two later. In the meantime, they would be free to gather their thoughts and make notes if they wished to do so. The instructions were as follows:

Attached is a list of 12 types of problem student that elementary teachers often identify as time consuming, frustrating, and/or worrisome to teach. For the interview, you will be asked to draw upon your knowledge and teaching experience in order to tell how to handle each of these 12 types of problem student.

We are interested in whatever you have to say about each problem student type, so that we will schedule as many appointments as we need. For each problem student type, first explain your general philosophy about dealing with this kind of student, indicating why you favor this approach over alternatives that you may be aware of. Then, list the specific strategies you would use. Try to be as richly descriptive as possible, including any step-by-step sequences that might be part of your larger strategy, as well as any back-up strategies you would use if your preferred method did not work. Explain exactly what you mean or give examples when you use terms like "reward" or "punishment."

In addition to describing your strategies, include an explanation of the rationale for each one (the assumptions upon which it is based; the reasons why it should work). Also, evaluate the relative success of various strategies you recommend. How likely are they to succeed, both in the short run and in the long run? Are certain strategies more successful than others? (We are also interested in strategies that do not work or why your recommended strategies are better). Include any important qualifications about particular strategies (Are some especially successful or unsuccessful with certain kinds of student? Are some feasible only if certain conditions are present? Are some successful only if used as a part of a broader approach?).

Interviewers were encouraged to probe more actively than during the vignette administration, but again without interrupting the teacher's train of

thought (unless it had gone into irrelevant material). If teachers did not spontaneously cover questions included in the instructions, the interviewers would prompt them. Also, the interviewer would ask for elaboration if the teacher mentioned some special program (token reward system, Magic Circle meeting, etc.) or unfamiliar concepts or procedures. In general, the interviewer's task was to elicit everything that the teacher had to say about dealing with each type of problem student and to be sure that the teacher's comments were clear and complete enough for us to understand and code accurately.

Data Preparation and Coding

The teachers' comments were transcribed and edited for correctness and for elimination of personal or institutional names. Responses to the 12 interviews and 24 vignettes then were content coded (separately) using categories developed by the authors (from review of the literature and inspection of a sample of 20 transcripts) and refined until they yielded at least 80% agreement when used independently by two staff members who had not been involved in their development. The transcripts were identified only by numbers, so that coders did not know how the teachers had been rated by the principal or the observer. The coding involved presence vs. absence decisions in which teachers whose transcripts included mention of the concepts or strategies subsumed within a coding category were scored "1" for that category and the other teachers were scored "0." Once their reliability was established on a subset of transcripts, the two staff members then coded all of the remaining transcripts in the larger set. Codes that they agreed upon were used as is, and disagreements were discussed until they were resolved.

Data Analysis and Display

Data on the frequencies with which categories were coded and on the relationships between these category codes and ratings of teachers' effectiveness in coping with problem students are shown in Table 1 (interview data) and Table 2 (vignette data). These tables are a reduced set of the total findings available, with reductions being achieved primarily by eliminating low-use categories that were not coded for at least six teachers. A few such categories do appear in the tables because they have theoretical importance or because (in Table 2) they were coded for fewer than six teachers for one vignette but six or more teachers for the other vignette.

The numbers to the left of the category descriptions in the tables indicate how many teachers were coded for each category. The maximum possible numbers were 95 for Table 1 and 97 for Table 2 (because codable transcriptions of interview responses were available for 95 teachers and codable transcriptions of vignette responses were available for 97 teachers). Since these numbers approach 100, the absolute numbers of teachers coded in the various categories also approximate the percentages of teachers coded in these categories.

Some of these numbers are followed by a plus sign, which indicates that coding of that category was positively associated with teacher effectiveness ratings (that is, that teachers who were coded "1" for the category had significantly higher effectiveness ratings than teachers who were coded "0" for the category). Similarly, minus signs following these numbers indicate that the category was negatively correlated with effectiveness ratings. Where a number appears without either a plus sign or a minus sign, no significant relationship between the category and the teacher effectiveness ratings was

Table 1

Interview Responses: Number of Teachers Coded for Each Category and Directions of Significant Relationships With Effectiveness Ratings

N	Coding Category
	A. General Problem Solving Approaches
38	1. Control/suppress undesirable behavior (as sole approach)
15	2. Shape desirable behavior
16+	3. Solve problem: Instruction/training/modeling/help (to eliminate the problem entirely)
25+	4. Help student cope with problem (but not eliminate entirely)
12	5. Identify and treat external causes
9	6. Insight (help student to recognize and understand the problem behavior)
9	7. Appeal/persuade/change attitudes
26	8. Encourage/reassure/build self-concept/provide supportive environment
	B. Specific Problem Solving Strategies
13	9. Extinguish/ignore the problem behavior
14+	10. Minimal intervention/redirect (brief requests or directions designed to re-engage the student in academic activities rather than to focus on the problem behavior)
8+	11. Minimize stress/embarrassment to the problem student
19+	12. Inhibit through physical proximity/voice control/eye contact
8	13. Support through physical proximity/voice control/eye contact
29	14. Time out for purposes of extinguishing the problem behavior or removing the student from the group
20+	15. Time out for purposes of allowing the problem student time to calm down or reflect
6	16. Critize, scold, or blame for misbehavior
49+	17. Punishment (threatened as deterrent or applied as retribution)
52	18. Proscribing: Limits, rules, expectations
16	19. Appeal/persuade (try to change the student's perceptions or attitudes through persuasion)
11	20. Contracts/commitment to goals

Table 1 (cont'd.)

N	Coding Category
42	21. Prescribing/telling/instructing/eliciting guidelines for appropriate behavior
6	22. Direct modeling (teacher models or demonstrates desirable behavior or coping skills as part of direct instruction that occurs during private interaction just with the problem student)
6	23. Indirect modeling (teacher models during public interaction with the class as a whole rather than during private interaction just with the problem student)
19	24. Praise
28	25. Reward (promised as incentive or delivered as reinforcement)
6	26. Encourage/express positive expectations
7	27. Kid gloves treatment (teacher withholds, postpones, or minimizes negative response so as not to further frustrate the student)
15	28. Identify and attempt to eliminate external source of problem
17	29. Counseling, producing insight
8	30. Build self-concept
12+	31. Build a close personal relationship with the student
18	32. Change seat/isolate (permanently, not just as time out)
7	33. Change peer relationships/create new social roles
21	34. Group meetings for social skills or problem solving
7+	35. Involve peers for support
9	36. Involve peers to pressure or punish
26	37. Involve parents for support or problem solving
15	38. Involve parents to pressure or punish
30-	39. Involve school-based authority figures or professionals to support or problem solve
12	40. Involve school-based authority figures to pressure or punish
18	41. Rough treatment (paddling or manhandling students when they mistreat peers)
9	42. Catharsis (allow them to work off anger by pounding clay, etc.)
7	43. Ventilation (listen sympathetically when they verbalize concerns or anger)
14	44. Conference with antagonist and victim

Table 1 (cont'd.)

N	Coding Category
6	45. Apology (demanded or suggested)
11	46. Restitution (demanded or suggested)
22	47. Physical restraint (to inhibit violence until the student calms down--not punishment or rough treatment)
6+	48. Underscore responsibility for outcomes of aggression (such as by requiring the student to personally confess or explain his aggressive behavior to his parents or the parents of the victim)
	C. Socialization Messages/Rationales for Demands
36-	49. No socialization messages or demand rationales coded
13+	50. Appeal to classroom or school rules to justify demands for improved behavior
14+	51. Reciprocity (student has brought punishment on himself by choosing to behave aggressively)
11	52. Moralizing/lecturing/labeling (scold student or label behavior as inappropriate without mentioning any of the substantive reasons coded in the next four categories)
8	53. Golden Rule/empathy appeals
13	54. Appeal to students' sense of fairness or concept of themselves as considerate or cooperative in dealing with peers
7	55. Teacher appeal (uses "I" statements to try to show aggressive students that their behavior upsets or frustrates the teacher)
10	56. Build prosocial attitudes/desire for friendship with peers
	D. Instruction
49	57. None
23	58. Explain to the student the reasons for his own aggression
6	59. Teach strategies for avoiding conflict
10+	60. Instruct student to take time to cool off or think before acting when frustrated or angry
7	61. Teach skills for solving particular interpersonal problems
7	62. Instruct student in methods of being polite or making friends
	E. Problem Prevention/Environmental Structuring Strategies
43-	63. None
18	64. Change seating to isolate problem student from all peers

Table 1 (cont'd.)

N	Coding Category
7	65. Change seating to keep problem student away from particular peers that he tends to fight with
28+	66. Monitor the problem student closely/intervene quickly to prevent escalation of problems
	F. Group Work and Peer Involvement Methods
60	67. None
16	68. Class meetings
9	69. Induce peer pressure on the problem studnet
12	70. Promote peer understanding or support for the problem student
11	71. Promote a general sense of community in the classroom
	G. Introducing Changes Into the Teacher-Student Relationship
21	72. None
18	73. Special activities: Chores, errands, or collaborative activities with the teacher
14	74. Extra attention or surface friendliness expressed through praise, flattery, etc.
18+	75. Direct expression of positive affect or positive perceptions of the student
12	76. Sympathetic listening (when angry students want to express their concerns or ventilate their anger)
17	77. Be fair (make it a point to treat hostile-aggressive students fairly and give due consideration to their side of the story)
34+	78. Be firm (set firm limits against aggression and make it clear that these will be enforced if necessary)
	H. Strategies Identified as Ineffective
23-	79. None
35+	80. Physical or verbal assault on the student
11	81. Punishment
15+	82. Demanding, insisting, nagging, lecturing, arguing
7	83. Reporting to the parents

Table 1 (cont'd.)

N	Coding Category
12	84. Ignoring or tolerating aggression
7	85. Isolating the student from peers
	I. Purpose of Time Out (if mentioned)
35	86. Punish the student or expel him from the classroom
28	87. Provide the student time to calm down and cool off
9	88. Provide time to evaluate and reflect on his behavior
	J. Reasons Given to Explain Aggression
24	89. None
32+	90. Parental modeling of aggression or mistreatment of the child
15	91. Parental neglect of the child
12	92. Other stress in the home
22-	93. Displacement of pent-up anger
24	94. Aggressive students act out to get attention or because their past aggression has been reinforced
	K. Miscellaneous
57	95. Teacher's response includes long-term prevention or cure strategies
22	96. Teacher's response includes different strategies for differentiated subtypes of the problem
34+	97. Teacher would get more information by interviewing the problem student
11-	98. Teacher would get more information by consulting school records, past teachers, or the principal

Table 2

Vignette Responses: Number of Teachers Coded for Each Category and Directions of Significant Relationships With Effectiveness Ratings

Vig. A	Vig. B	Coding Category
		A. General Problem Solving Appraoches
42+	35	1. Improve mental hygiene or coping skills
5	13	2. Shape through rewards
78	72	3. Control through threat or punishment
		B. Attributional Inferences
58-	68	4. Locus of causality: internal to student
77	66-	5. Controllability: student can control problem behavior
80	74-	6. Intentionality: student acts intentionally
88	88	7. Stability: problem is stable over time
76	72	8. Globality: problem is generalized across situations
94	91	9. Locus of causality: external to the teacher
34	52+	10. Controllability: teacher can effect change
49	41	11. Stability: teacher expects stable improvement
54+	43+	12. Globality: teacher expects generalized improvement
		C. Types of Punishment Mentioned
21+	39	13. None
8	25	14. Isolation of student from peers
57	27-	15. Referral to the principal, the parent, or another adult for punishment
		D. Types of Supportive Behavior Mentioned
13	14	16. Kid gloves treatment
6	11	17. Supportive isolation (isolated seating intended as support rather than punishment)
11+	4	18. Involve peers in providing support or help
16+	6	19. Involve parents in providing support or help
16	7	20. Involve other adults in providing support or help

Table 2 (cont'd.)

Vig. A	Vig. B	Coding Category
32	23	21. Instruction (in better means of coping)
		E. Types of Threatening or Pressuring Behaviors Mentioned
13	11	22. Specific behavioral criticism
4	10	23. Global personal criticism
3	6+	24. Third-degree grilling
		F. Specific Strategies for Responding to the Depicted Problem
34	13-	25. Delegates responsibility for the problem to someone else
11-	30	26. Brief management response to the incident
4	8	27. Offers reward for improved behavior
49	46-	28. Threatens or delivers punishment for aggression
24+	20	29. Prescribes or models more desirable behavior or better coping strategies
24	23	30. Proscribes, sets limits against unacceptable behavior
17	13-	31. Change social environment
29	16	32. Identify and eliminate source of problem
4	12	33. Catharsis
22	30	34. Develop student's insight
19+	3	35. Involve the parents
		G. Rationales or Justifications for Behavior Change Demands
17	11	36. No behavior change demands made
36	41	37. Offers no rationales or justifications for demands
7	17	38. Cites school or classroom rules
4	7+	39. Makes personal appeal
18	8	40. Moralizes
19	9	41. Attempts to induce empathy for victims
10+	14+	42. Logical analysis linking aggressive behavior to outcomes that are contrary to the student's best interests
2	9	43. Appeals to pride or positive self-concept

Table 2 (cont'd.)

Vig. A	Vig. B	Coding Category
		H. Gets More Information Before Taking Action
41+	19	44. Lets Tom or Ron tell his story before acting
17	41	45. Suspends judgment and hears both sides before assigning blame or taking action
		I. Content of Socialization or Instruction Attempt
21	7	46. Develop empathy or Golden Rule morality
18+	27	47. Moralizing/lecturing
26+	31	48. Instruction (in better methods of coping with frustration or controlling aggression)
62	43-	49. Punishment (including informing the parents with the implication that they should punish)
	17	50. Tells Ron that in the future he should inform the teacher when he is frustrated or angry and let the teacher handle the problem
		J. Methods for Following Up on the Incident
18	11-	51. Attempt to identify and address unmet needs
5	4	52. Peer involvement (class meetings, Magic Circle, etc.)
	20+	53. Teach self-control or coping skills
		K. Conferences with the Aggressor and/or the Victim
50	44-	54. Talks to the aggressor (Tom, Ron) first
37	22	55. Sees the two boys separately
12	7	56. Sees them separately, then together
17	36	57. Sees them together only
8	12	58. Sees them together first, then sees the aggressor (Tom, Ron) alone
		L. Threatening or Delivering Punishment
23	42+	59. No threats or punishment mentioned
12	13	60. Threatens to punish repetition of aggression
60	37-	61. Punishes now
		M. Settling the Immediate Incident
	19-	62. Fails to settle the incident
	43	63. Speaks to both boys privately

Table 2 (cont'd.)

Vig. A	Vig. B	Coding Category
	28	64. Tries to protect Phil from further aggression
	4	65. Has the boys fight it out
	20+	66. Has the boys talk it out
	7	67. Demands apology or restitution from Ron
		N. Socialization or Instruction of Ron
	69+	68. Makes attempt to change Ron
	61	69. Goal is suppression of aggression
	10+	70. Goal is temper control
	5	71. Goal is acceptable anger release
	22	72. Goal is better coping skills
	9	73. Goal is improved empathy or Golden Rule morality
		O. Miscellaneous
	19-	74. Invokes automatic reaction rule concerning fighting in the classroom
47		75. Sees that Sam gets lunch or money to buy lunch
13+		76. Reassures Sam that he will be protected from further aggression
23+		77. If Tom denies any wrongdoing, teacher nevertheless assumes his guilt and proceeds accordingly
14		78. If Tom denies any wrongdoing, teacher sends him to the principal

observed. Finally, where no information at all appears in the columns for either Vignette A or Vignette B in Table 2, the category applied only to the other vignette.

The plus and minus signs reflect significant relationships that appeared in either or both of two analyses relating the coding categories to teacher effectiveness ratings. The first analysis correlated teachers' scores (0 vs. 1) for the coding categories with numbers reflecting their principals' opinions of their effectiveness in coping with problem students (1 = average, 2 = outstanding). For these analyses, correlations that reached the .05 level of statistical significance (typically corresponding to r's of $\pm$.17 or higher) were considered significant.

The second set of analyses involved comparing extreme groups identified by considering the principals' and the observers' ratings in combination. Specifically, these analyses involved comparing the 23 teachers who were both classified as outstanding by the principals and rated high (either 4 or 5 on the 5-point scale) by the observers with the 20 teachers who were both classified as average by the principals and rated low (1 or 2 on the 5-point scale) by the observers.

For these extreme groups analyses, the numbers of teachers in each group that were coded for a particular category were expressed as proportions of the total numbers in the group (e.g., 23 or 20), and then a one-way analysis of variance was run to test the statistical significance of the difference in proportion scores. When the F-values from these analyses were large enough to reach the .05 level of statistical significance, the relationships they reflected were identified by inserting plus or minus signs into the tables.

Thus, plus or minus signs in the tables indicate that the signified relationship was supported by statistically significant findings from the correlations with principals' ratings, the analyses of variance comparing extreme groups, or both. We chose to include significant extreme groups differences along with significant correlations with the principals' ratings when reporting our findings because, although we believe that the principals' ratings were generally more valid and based on more directly relevant information than the observers' ratings, we also believe that some principals put too much emphasis on the teachers' abilities to control disruptive students during conflict situations and not enough on teachers' abilities to help such students develop better attitudes and coping skills or to help problem student types (failure syndrome, perfectionist, immature, shy/withdrawn) that appear to require sympathy and encouragement more than control or discipline. The observers' ratings appear to have taken these teacher characteristics into account, so that this perspective is reflected in the extreme groups analyses (which reflect the observers' as well as the principals' opinions).

In addition to the analyses run for the total sample, correlations of coding category scores with principals' effectiveness ratings were also computed separately for teachers working in the early grades (K-3) vs. the later grades (4-6) and for teachers working in Small City vs. Big City. These subsample correlations generally paralleled the correlations for the sample as a whole, although occasionally contrasting patterns were observed suggesting that what is effective in the early grades or in Small City differs from what is effective in the later grades or in Big City. These grade level and location differences are not shown in the tables but are described in the text.

Responses to the General Strategy Interview

Hostile-aggressive students were described to the teachers as follows:

These children express hostility through direct, intense behaviors. They are not easily controlled.

1. intimidates and threatens
2. hits and pushes
3. damages property
4. antagonizes
5. hostile
6. easily angered

The categories used for coding responses to interview questions about coping with such students are shown in Table 1, which also shows the number of teachers coded for each category and the direction (plus or minus) of the relationship between the teachers' presence-absence scores for the category and their ratings of effectiveness with problem students.

General Trends in the Teachers' Responses

The first eight categories (Section A in the table) reflect the teachers' general problem-solving approaches. Category 1 (attempt to control or suppress aggressive behavior) was coded only when this was the sole approach reported; it was not coded when the teacher reported one or more of the approaches included in Categories 2-8. Virtually all of the teachers mentioned attempts to control or suppress aggression as part of their response, so the key issue was not whether they tried to control or suppress aggression but whether they also tried to develop more desirable insights, attitudes, or coping skills in the aggressive student.

The data revealed that 38 teachers confined their responses to attempts to control or suppress aggressive behavior. The remaining 57 teachers reported attempts to do something in addition or instead: encourage or reassure aggressive students, build up their self-concepts, or provide a

supportive environment (26 teachers), help them cope with the problem (25), teach them strategies that would eliminate the problem (16), shape improved behavior through incentives (15), identify and treat external causes (12), develop insight (9), or change attitudes through persuasion (9).

These same trends can be seen in the frequencies with which the teachers mentioned more specific problem solving strategies (Section B). The most frequently mentioned strategies were proscribing against or setting limits on aggressive behavior (52), threatening or punishing (49), and prescribing desirable behavior by telling, instructing, or eliciting (42). Thus, more than half of the teachers mentioned speaking to aggressive students about their behavior and threatening them with punishment if they did not improve. Other commonly mentioned strategies were involving school-based authority figures or professionals to help solve the problem (30), imposing time out for extinction or removal purposes (29), offering rewards for improved behavior (28), physically restraining aggressive students until they calm down (22), group work with the class as a whole (21), imposing or offering time out as an opportunity to calm down and reflect (20), praising desirable behavior (19), inhibiting through physical proximity, voice control, or eye contact (19), isolating aggressive students from their peers (18), rough treatment of aggressive students when they mistreat peers (18), counseling in an attempt to promote insight (17), persuasion (16), attempts to eliminate the source of the problem (15), and involving the parents to pressure or punish (15).

Smaller numbers of teachers mentioned using behavioral contracts or trying to elicit commitment to improvement goals (11), suggesting that aggressive students achieve catharsis by acting out their anger against substitute objects (9), encouraging these students to ventilate their anger

verbally (7), or taking actions designed to underscore their responsibility for the outcomes of their aggression (6). Categories representing attempts to ignore or minimize the problem or to respond to it in very minor ways were used infrequently (unsurprisingly, given the intensity and disruptiveness of aggressive behavior). Surprisingly, only two teachers mentioned involving outside medical or mental health professionals.

The data in Section C indicate that 59 (e.g., 95-36) teachers were coded for socializing attitudes and beliefs or rationalizing demands for change in behavior. These various appeals and rationales were spread relatively evenly across the categories of Section C; no category was coded for more than 14 teachers.

The data in Section D indicate that slightly fewer than half (46) of the teachers were coded for some attempt to instruct aggressive students or develop their coping skills. Attempts to develop insight by suggesting reasons why these students might be behaving aggressively were reported by 23 teachers; none of the other categories was coded for more than 10 teachers.

The data in Section E indicate that 52 teachers were coded for some form of problem prevention or environmental structuring. Most of these codes were for monitoring the student closely in order to intervene quickly when necessary (28) or for seating the student in isolation from peers (18).

The Section F data indicate that only 35 teachers mentioned group work or peer involvement. These codes were spread relatively evenly among the categories in this section.

The data in Section G indicate that 74 teachers were coded for one or more categories involving introducing changes in the teacher-student relationship. The most frequently coded of these (34) was making it clear

that the teacher intended to be firm in enforcing prohibitions against aggression. The remaining categories all involved attempts to develop and use a personal relationship with the problem student: providing the student with opportunities to engage in special activities (18), directly expressing positive affect (18), stating the intention to be fair (17), consistently providing attention and surface friendliness (14), and listening sympathetically when these students are angry or upset (12).

The data in Section H indicate that 72 teachers mentioned one or more strategies that they saw as ineffective. Physical or verbal assault on the student (35) was the most frequently mentioned of these; the rest were mentioned by 15 teachers or fewer. Among teachers who mentioned time out (Section I), almost half described it as a way to punish the student or expel him from the classroom and the rest described it as a way to give the student time to calm down or to reflect on his behavior.

In attributing hostile-aggressive behavior to causes (Section J), the teachers stressed factors occurring in the home: parental modeling or mistreatment of the child (32), displacement of pent-up anger (typically described as anger in response to events that occur in the home) (22), parental neglect (15), or other stress in the home (12). However, 24 teachers mentioned an alternative cause by suggesting that some students behave aggressively because it brings them attention or other forms of reinforcement.

The Section K data indicate that 57 teachers' responses included long-term prevention or cure strategies, but only 22 included different strategies for differentiated subtypes of aggressive students. Among teachers who spoke of getting more information, 34 mentioned interviewing the student and 11 mentioned consulting the school records, previous teachers, or the principal.

Taken together, the frequency data suggest that the modal teacher response to hostile-aggressive students was to reassert prohibitions against aggression and the intention to be firm in enforcing these prohibitions, but then also to try to establish and work within a personal relationship with these students to resocialize their attitudes and beliefs, shape more desirable forms of behavior, or develop more effective coping skills through instruction or counseling. Less typical patterns included on the one hand, restricting response to controlling or punitive reactions, and on the other hand, restricting interventions to purely positive and supportive strategies without firmly proscribing aggressive behavior and being prepared to impose sanctions if this proscription was not heeded. Despite the serious and provocative nature of aggression, only a slight majority of the teachers mentioned punishment, and half of these mentioned it as a back-up or last resort strategy rather than as an immediate response to aggressive behavior.

In its general lines of approach, the modal response described above follows the principles commonly suggested by contemporary sources of expert advice to teachers (such as Glasser, 1977, or Good & Brophy, 1987) who stress the need to combine support and assistance to problem students with behavioral limits and insistence that they accept responsibility for their actions. However, few if any of the teachers could be descibed as exhaustive or systematic in articulating these principles and elaborating on their implementation. Thus, as expected, the teachers were operating primarily from experience-based intuition rather than codified knowledge.

Relationships Between Interview Responses and Effectiveness Ratings

In general, the higher rated teachers had longer, richer protocols than the lower rated teachers. They mentioned more general approaches and gave

more details about specific strategies for implementing these approaches. The lower rated teachers often had little to say beyond mentioning the most frequently occurring categories (prescribing, proscribing, threatening punishment). Many of them did not really have strategies for coping with aggressive students beyond speaking with them about their behavior and perhaps threatening punishment, so they often mentioned seeking help from parents or school authority figures. This is why involving the principal or other school-based authority figures or professionals to help solve the problem (Category 39) was correlated negatively with effectiveness ratings.

Inspection of the variables that correlated positively suggests a pattern of effective response to aggressive students that fits well with the theorizing of Patterson (1982) about the causes of aggression and of writers such as Glasser (1977), Good and Brophy (1987), or Roedell, Slaby, and Robinson (1976) about methods for responding to it; that is, the higher rated teachers treated aggression as a behavioral problem developed primarily in response to parental modeling or mistreatment that called for limit-setting and socialization within the context of holding aggressive students responsible for their behavior and pressing them to change it (rather than treating aggression as a neurotic symptom calling for assistance in developing insight about inner conflicts).

The higher rated teachers combined firm limit-setting with willingness to try to resocialize aggressive students or help them learn to cope with frustration more effectively. On one hand, they would make it a point to be firm in proscribing aggression and warning that continued aggression would be punished. They would also monitor these students closely and seat them nearby or move near them frequently. This monitoring put aggressive students on

notice that they were being watched closely, and it enabled the teacher to become aware of potentially explosive situations early and thus be able to intervene quickly before the problem could escalate. It also enabled them to inhibit incipient misconduct merely by moving closer to aggressive students or catching their eye (without having to interrupt the flow of the lesson in order to reprimand them verbally). In short, the higher rated teachers were assertive in reaffirming limits on aggressive students, making it clear that they were serious about these limits and prepared to enforce them with sanctions if necessary.

On the other hand, these teachers also tended to mention reaching out to aggressive students by building closer personal relationships with them, trying to resocialize their attitudes and beliefs, and helping them learn better methods of coping with frustration and resolving conflicts. Many higher rated teachers tried to avoid publicly singling out or blaming aggressive students, especially in response to minor incidents that could be handled with minimal intervention/redirection strategies or other strategies that would minimize stress or embarrassment to the student. These teachers also tended to report using time out as an enabling mechanism (an opportunity for an upset or angry aggressive student to calm down, reflect, and regain control before returning to the group), rather than as a punitive mechanism.

The higher rated teachers tried to help aggressive students develop more desirable behavior by instructing them in strategies for solving or at least coping better with their personal and social problems. Although none mentioned cognitive behavior modification or self-control training explicitly, many of these teachers mentioned the self-talk involved in coping effectively with problem situations and emphasized the use of time out to provide

opportunities for aggressive students to reflect on their behavior and think about ways they could have handled the situation more effectively.

The socialization messages that correlated positively with effectiveness ratings were those that involved making it clear to aggressive students that aggression was against the rules and that they would have to accept responsibility and take the consequences for aggressive behavior. Six teachers mentioned unusual measures such as requiring the student to call his parents or the parents of his victim and personally confess his behavior. Such teacher attempts to underscore personal responsibility for the outcomes of aggression were also correlated positively with effectiveness ratings. To some extent, then, the data support Glasser's (1969, 1977) ideas about coping with problem students (e.g., hold them responsible for their behavior and demand that they obey reasonable rules). However, the data do not support several of the more specific strategies that Glasser has suggested (class meetings, getting input regarding solutions and commitment to change behavior from the problem student). These more specific strategies were not mentioned often and did not correlate consistently with effectiveness ratings. The same was true of most strategies reflecting attempts to develop the student's insight, including explaining to the student the reasons for his aggressive behavior, a strategy that has been recommended to teachers by Dreikurs (1968).

Two additional categories that correlated positively with effectiveness ratings were for directly expressing positive affect toward or positive perceptions of the student (18) and enlisting one or more peers to act as a buddy by helping the aggressive student calm down during tense situations or providing other assistance and support (7). In combination with several other findings already mentioned, these findings underscore the point that the

higher rated teachers would treat aggressive students as continuing members of the classroom group and try to reinforce and build on their capacities for exercising self-control and interacting prosocially with peers, rather than treating them as outcasts who needed to be isolated from peers and controlled through threat of punishment. In short, the higher rated teachers had not given up on aggressive students and were trying to resocialize them, not merely control them.

This is also seen in the data on strategies that the teachers identified as ineffective. The higher rated teachers recognized that physical or verbal assault on the student would not be helpful, and several also mentioned that demanding, lecturing, nagging, and so forth would be ineffective as well (these teachers often went on to explain that aggressive students need a combination of firm limit-setting with assistance in learning how to cope more effectively).

It was somewhat surprising that the lower rated teachers were more likely than the higher rated teachers to mention displacement of pent-up anger as a cause of aggressive behavior. This response was associated with several categories reflecting supportive responses to aggressive students, but not with categories reflecting firm action taken to stop aggressive behavior. Apparently, the teachers who viewed aggression as displacement of pent-up anger tended to view aggressive students more as victims (of their own anger) than as victimizers and to view their tendencies to develop and act out intense rage as natural and perhaps uncontrollable. Thus, even though it appears to be true that much aggression occurs as displacement of pent-up anger or frustration, it also appears to be true that teachers should not overreact to this point to the extent that they fail to hold aggressive

students accountable for their behavior and fail to assist these students in achieving better self-control and learning more effective coping strategies.

Among teachers who mentioned seeking more information, the higher rated teachers were more likely to interview the student, whereas the lower rated teachers were more likely to consult school records, past teachers, or the principal. This appears to be part of a more general trend suggesting that the lower rated teachers had low confidence and limited repertoires of strategies to call upon when confronted with hostile-aggressive students, leading them to seek help from other adults.

The fact that only two of the teachers even mentioned the possibility of referral to outside mental health experts is surprising, given that aggression is a very serious problem. It is possible that teachers lack confidence in the skills of psychotherapists or other mental health professionals, although no teacher expressed such reservations. More likely, teachers do not typically think about referrals to mental health experts outside of the school system. Instead, they tend (or are instructed) to refer students to a social worker, counselor, or school psychologist connected with the school system, leaving the question of outside referral to this other individual.

The lack of a positive relationship for Category 95 (mention of long-term prevention or cure strategies) was surprising, because both theoretical considerations and the general trends in the present findings would predict a positive relationship here. Apparently, the positive relationship did not occur, not because long-term cure or prevention strategies are not productive with aggressive students, but because they were likely to be mentioned frequently by teachers who did not have many other ideas. Any mention of "getting to the bottom" of the problem or "finding out what's causing" the

problem was coded as a long-term prevention or cure strategy (e.g., identify and treat external causes of problem behavior), so that many teachers were credited with mention of such strategies on the basis of brief and vague statements such as "I'd try to figure out what was causing the problem and then deal with it."

Grade Level and Location Comparisons

The data for the study as a whole (e.g., considering all 12 types of problem student) revealed several consistent grade level and location differences in the teachers' interview and vignette responses, including those concerning hostile-aggressive students. Teachers in the lower grades more often mentioned behavioral shaping and environmental engineering strategies, as well as strategies for providing support, assistance, or counseling to problem students. Teachers in the upper grades were more likely to mention making demands or threatening punishment, as well as trying to change attitudes through logical appeal or persuasion. Small City teachers gave longer and more detailed responses and mentioned more of most types of strategies that called for time-consuming and individualized attention to problem students. In contrast, Big City teachers were more likely to restrict their interventions to strategies designed to control problem behavior on the spot (without including long-term prevention or cure strategies).

There were no contradictions (e.g., cases where the same coding category showed a significant positive correlation with the principals' effectiveness rating in the lower grades but a significant negative correlation in the upper grades, or vice versa) in the grade-level comparisons for the interview data, although a few variables yielded a correlation of $\pm$.30 or greater in one of the groups but a near-zero correlation in the other group. Building and using

a personal relationship with the student and attempting to promote peer understanding and support for the student were correlated positively in the upper grades, whereas mention of shaping and environmental engineering/ prevention strategies was correlated positively in the lower grades. These differences make sense given what is known about developmental differences in students at these grade levels.

The Small City vs. Big City comparisons yielded two contradictory findings: Teachers' expression of concern about quickly re-establishing an instructional focus following an incident of aggression and teachers' calling for suspension or expulsion following one or two repetitions of aggression were correlated negatively with principals' ratings in Small City but positively in Big City. Neither of these contrasts was specifically expected, but each can be understood post facto as reflecting differences in the nature and intensity of aggression faced by teachers in the two locations. Given that outbursts of aggression have the potential for not merely disrupting classroom activities but causing them to degenerate into chaos, and given that the Big City teachers were teaching larger classes containing greater numbers of aggressive students but with less adult help, it is understandable that these teachers would be concerned about maintaining the continuity of their instructional program and that suspension or expulsion from class might be appropriate (necessary, even if not desirable) for repeat offenders. Ideally, these students would receive some form of treatment geared to change their attitudes and behavior in addition to being expelled from the class, and their expulsion would take the form of in-school detention or some other method that would allow and encourage them to keep up with academic demands during the suspension period, but in the meantime, their

removal from class would at least keep them from nullifying the teacher's efforts to educate their classmates and would protect these classmates against attack.

In addition to these two sets of contradictory correlations, one category showed a correlation greater than $\pm$.30 in Big City but only a negligible correlation in Small City. There was a negative relationship in Big City for stating that reporting aggressive behavior to the parents is an ineffective strategy. Thus, Big City teachers who made this statement tended to be lower rated teachers. This finding fits well with the findings of Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbaker (1979) and others who have reported that insistence on making the school a safe physical environment and involvement of the parents are two key factors determining the effectiveness of schools serving students from predominantly low socioeconomic status families.

In summary, contrasting findings across locations suggest that the Big City teachers were concerned first about protecting classmates from being harmed by aggressive students and preventing these students from disrupting the continuity of the instructional program, and only secondarily about providing socialization, counseling, or other treatment designed to help these students learn to respond more effectively to frustration and conflict. Small City teachers were less likely to be confronted with extreme forms of chronic aggression, so they could concentrate more on resocializing aggressive students than on merely controlling them.

The previously presented data on the teachers' responses to the interview can be seen as indicators of their general philosophy about coping with hostile and aggressive students. What follow are data on their responses to specific (simulated) events involving such students. These data can be seen

as reports of the teachers' implementations or operationalizations of their general philosophy: sketches of what happens to their "working theory" when they become engaged in a conflict situation with a hostile student.

Responses to Vignette A

Vignette A reads as follows:

> This morning, several students excitedly tell you that on the way to school they saw Tom beating up Sam and taking his lunch money. Tom is the class bully and has done things like this many times.

Data on the teachers' responses to Vignette A are shown in the left-most columns of Table 2.

General Trends in the Teachers' Responses

The data in Section A indicate that most (78) teachers mentioned attempting to control Tom through threat or punishment. In addition or instead, 42 mentioned trying to improve Tom's mental hygiene or coping skills, and 5 mentioned trying to shape improved behavior through rewards. These general trends involve more power assertion and less supportive counseling or socialization than is seen for most of the other problem student types addressed in the larger study, underscoring the teachers' needs to control the class and protect peers from harm by aggressive students.

The attributional inference data (Section B) indicate that a majority (58) of the teachers attributed Tom's problems to causes internal to him rather than to partly or wholly external causes. In addition, most saw Tom as able to control his aggressive behavior if he made the effort to do so (77), as acting intentionally in mistreating Sam (80), and as displaying a problem that was stable over time (88) and generalized across situations (76). The teachers were less confident about achieving significant change in Tom than

they were about changing most of the other students depicted in our vignettes. Only 34 teachers expressed unambiguous confidence that they could improve the situation, and only small majorities believed that whatever changes they could effect would be stable over time (49) and generalized across situations (54). These expectations appear realistic, given that chronic hostile-aggressive behavior, especially the sort of unprovoked and essentially criminal behavior depicted in the vignette, is more serious and difficult for teachers to reverse than most of the other problem behaviors addressed in our study.

Sections L and C indicate that the majority of the teachers would either threaten (12) or invoke (60) punishment in response to the depicted incident, typically by informing the principal or the parents of Tom's behavior (57). Only 3 teachers mentioned physical punishment.

A majority (61) of the teachers mentioned at least one form of supportive behavior (Section D). The most frequent of these was providing Tom with instruction (32), followed by involving the parents (16), other adults (16), or the peers (11) in supportive ways or supplying kid gloves treatment to Tom during times when he was frustrated or upset (13).

Despite the frequency with which punishment was mentioned, only a minority (22) of the teachers mentioned additional threatening or pressuring behaviors (Section E). Of these, severe personal criticism of Tom for his specific behavior (13) was the only one mentioned by more than five teachers.

The data in Section F indicate that the most commonly mentioned strategies for responding to the depicted problem were punishment (49), delegating the problem to the principal or another authority figure (34), trying to identify and eliminate the source of the problem (29), prescribing or modeling more desirable behavior (24), proscribing undesirable behavior

(24), trying to promote Tom's insight (22), changing Tom's social environment (17), and brief management responses (11). Failure to respond at all and strategies involving indirect behavior modification or shaping, improving Tom's self-concept, or catharsis were never mentioned by more than 4 teachers. In general, then, the teachers favored direct socialization strategies focused on Tom's behavior over indirect strategies or strategies focused on his self-concept or personality.

The data in Section G indicate that 17 teachers did not mention making behavior change demands on Tom, and another 36 mentioned such demands but did not mention supporting rationales or justifications (presumably they assumed that Tom was well aware that what he was doing was wrong). Of the 44 teachers (e.g., 97-53) who included rationales or justifications, the majority would attempt to induce empathy (19), moralize or lecture (18), or try to persuade Tom that his behavior was self-defeating (10). In general, then, beyond punishing him for the incident depicted in the vignette, the most commonly reported responses to Tom involved communicating strong messages about his conduct--prescribing guidelines for expected behavior and trying to get him to understand the seriousness and consequences of aggression.

In describing their responses to the immediate incident (Sections O & H), only 56 teachers mentioned providing help to Sam in addition to dealing with Tom, and most of these limited themselves to seeing that Sam got his lunch or money to buy it (47). Only 13 teachers mentioned trying to protect Sam or reassure him that the problem would not recur. The majority of the teachers would consider Tom guilty based on what they had heard from the other students, although 41 would allow Tom to tell his story before taking action. Only 17 would suspend judgment and hear both sides before deciding whether Tom

was guilty. Among teachers who mentioned the possiblity that Tom might deny any wrongdoing, the majority would either simply assume his guilt and proceed accordingly (23) or send him to the principal at that point (14). Only one teacher said that no further action could be taken because the stories conflicted and no adult had witnessed the alleged incident.

All but one teacher spoke of trying to socialize Tom (Section I), although for many this attempt would be confined to punishing Tom or informing his parents about his behavior. Most, however, would provide socialization in the form of instruction (26), Golden Rule/empathy appeals (21), or moralizing or berating Tom (18). Most of what was said and done would occur in the immediate situation or shortly thereafter, however; only about a third of the teachers were coded for long-term or follow-up strategies (Section J). The majority of the teachers mentioned talking only to Tom or talking to the boys separately rather than seeing them together (Section K).

In summary, most teachers viewed Tom as we had intended him to be viewed in constructing the vignette: as a chronically hostile-aggressive student who apparently had just completed an unprovoked attack on and robbery of a classmate. Their responses stressed immediate and active intervention to punish the present misbehavior, warn Tom against similar misbehavior in the future, and to an extent, undo the damage done in the incident.

Relationships Between Vignette A Responses and Effectiveness Ratings

Most lower rated teachers would not do much other than speak to Tom about his behavior and then punish him either personally or by informing the principal or the parents. Perhaps these teachers had no other ideas about how to resocialize Tom or perhaps they did not believe that their efforts could succeed. In any case, the lower rated teachers tended to confine their

response to Tom to attempts to control his behavior by threatening or invoking punishment. A few of these teachers also mentioned brief management responses or other minimal intervention strategies as additional control mechanisms, although this was unrealistic given Tom's aggressive behavior.

In contrast, the higher rated teachers believed that they could improve Tom's behavior and thus spoke of attempting to change Tom rather than merely to control his behavior. A minority would try to "reach" Tom by moralizing or berating him while delivering a stern lecture on the unacceptability of aggression. This approach is not optimal, but it is preferable to the resignation shown by lower rated teachers in that it illustrates teacher belief that change is possible and willingness to try to bring it about. At least to the extent that it communicates caring and positive expectations, such "lecturing" can be seen as an appropriate response to Tom's behavior by the minority of the higher rated teachers who reported it.

The majority of the higher rated teachers, however, reported trying to improve Tom's mental hygiene (by counseling him) or to prescribe, model, or instruct him in better means of coping with frustration and handling conflict. In addition to providing direct input or assistance to Tom through these mechanisms, such teachers would create a general climate of support for Tom by enlisting the help of the peers or parents and by creating a positive emphasis on improvement rather than an emphasis on threat of punishment. For example, these teachers would allow Tom to tell his story before taking action in response to the incident, even though they would already have assumed his guilt based on information gleaned from the other students. This suggests a willingness to enter into a dialogue with him (i.e., not just to "talk at him") and thus pave the way for subsequent counseling efforts.

In addition, the higher rated teachers were more likely to recognize and try to meet Sam's needs--not only by seeing that Sam got his lunch or money but by reassuring him that the situation would be handled effectively and that he would not have to face further abuse from Tom.

Finally, the higher rated teachers were well represented among the 10 teachers who provided a rationale or justification for their behavioral change demands that featured logical analysis linking Tom's behavior to its consequences. Thus, besides indicating that his aggressive behavior was inappropriate or immoral, these teachers were likely to try to get Tom to see that such behavior was self-defeating--that it led to consequences that were undesirable even from Tom's own point of view.

No significant relationship with principals' ratings was seen for mention of follow-up strategies, but again, many of these codes were for vague comments about "getting to the bottom of the problem." Other categories that might have been expected to correlate positively with the principals' ratings but showed no significant correlations included physical isolation of Tom from his classmates, attempting to develop Tom's insight, and mention of Golden Rule/empathy justifications for behavioral change demands. In addition, several responses did not appear often enough to allow assessment of their relationships with effectiveness ratings: physical punishment, catharsis, behavioral shaping, and class meetings/Magic Circle techniques. Again, it appears that many of these responses did not correlate significantly with effectiveness ratings or appear frequently enough to allow assessment of such correlation because they reflected strategies that were not relevant or powerful enough to be effective reactions to aggressive behavior. These tended to be brief management or minimal intervention responses more suited to

minor inattentiveness than to serious aggression as well as various supportive and therapeutic techniques more suited to neurotic symptoms such as anxiety or inhibition than to behavior disorders.

Grade Level and Location Comparisons

Grade level comparisons of correlations between teachers' strategies and principals' ratings yielded no contradictions or noteworthy differential patterns. However, the location comparisons yielded one contradiction: Teacher delegation of responsibility for the problem to another authority was correlated positively with the principals' ratings in Small City but negatively in Big City. The negative relationship observed in Big City was expected and fits the general pattern of findings from the larger study indicating that teachers who deal with problems personally tend to get better results than teachers who refer them to someone else for solution. Consequently, the positive correlation observed in Small City is surprising. Perhaps incidents as serious as the one depicted in Vignette A occur so rarely in Small City that they are (appropriately?) seen as matters for the principal or for school-based mental health professionals to handle rather than the teacher.

Many categories showed positive correlations of .30 or higher in Big City but only negligible correlations in Small City. These mostly reflected resocialization strategies that were not often mentioned by Big City teachers: supportive behavior, prescribing/modeling, trying to develop Tom's insight, counseling, mention of rationales or justifications for behavior change demands, and Golden Rule/empathy rationales.

In summary, the data for Vignette A indicate that the higher rated teachers differed from the lower rated teachers by virtue of their attempts to

"reach" Tom and resocialize him rather than merely to control his aggression through threats of punishment. A few relied on severe scolding or berating, but most mentioned individual or group counseling that included prescription, modeling, or instruction in better self-control or coping strategies. These trends held up across grade level and geographical location, although counseling and resocialization strategies correlated more strongly with effectiveness ratings in Big City, where such strategies were mentioned less frequently, than in Small City.

Responses to Vignette B

Vignette B reads as follows:

> Class is disrupted by a scuffle. You look up to see that Ron has left his seat and gone to Phil's desk, where he is punching and shouting at Phil. Phil is not so much fighting back as trying to protect himself. You don't know how this started, but you do know that Phil gets along well with the other students and that Ron often starts fights and arguments without provocation.

Data on responses to Vignette B are also shown in Table 2.

General Trends in the Teachers' Responses

As with Tom in Vignette A, the data in Section A indicate that most (72) teachers mentioned trying to control Ron through threat or punishment, and in addition or instead, 35 mentioned trying to improve Ron's mental hygiene or coping skills and 13 mentioned trying to shape improved behavior through rewards or contracts. Again, these general trends indicate more power assertion and less supportive counseling or socialization than is seen in response to most of the other vignettes in the larger study.

The attributional inference data in Section B indicate that 68 teachers attributed Ron's aggressive behavior to causes located entirely within himself rather than attributing it partly or wholly to external causes; 66 saw Ron as

able to control his aggression if he made the effort; 74 saw Ron as acting intentionally in his treatment of Phil; 88 saw Ron's aggression as stable over time; and 72 saw it as generalized across situations. More than half (52) believed that they could achieve meaningful improvement in Ron's behavior, but fewer believed that whatever improvements they could achieve would be stable across time or generalized across situations.

Sections L and C indicate that a majority of the teachers would threaten or invoke punishment in response to Ron, although this was a slim majority rather than the heavy majority that spoke of punishing Tom. The two punishments mentioned most often were informing the principal or the parents of Ron's behavior (27) and isolation of Ron from his classmates (25).

Physical punishment of Ron was mentioned by 7 teachers. Although still small, this number is noticeably higher than the 3 teachers who spoke of physical punishment of Tom. This suggests that physical punishment is more likely to occur in reaction to ongoing misconduct (e.g., deliberate rough treatment of Ron while breaking up the fight) than as a response to equally serious misconduct that the teacher learns about only after it has been completed (e.g., paddling administered later as punishment of Tom).

A majority (55) of the teachers mentioned at least one form of supportive behavior (Section D), notably instruction (23), kid gloves treatment during tense situations (14), and supportive isolation from peers (11). Only 28 teachers mentioned threatening or pressuring behaviors in addition to punishment (Section E). Those mentioned by more than five teachers included severe personal criticism of Ron for his specific misbehavior (11), more global personal criticism of Ron (10), and third-degree methods of grilling and berating him for his misconduct (6).

The Section F data concern specific strategies for responding to the incident, of which the most commonly mentioned were punishment (46), brief management responses (30), trying to develop Ron's insight (30), proscribing aggressive behavior (23), prescribing or modeling desirable behavior (20), trying to identify and eliminate the source of the problem (16), delegating the problem to the principal or another authority figure (13), changing Ron's social environment (13), and encouraging Ron to achieve catharsis by acting out aggression against substitute objects (12). Compared to the pattern of frequent responses seen for Vignette A, the pattern for Vignette B shows less involvement of the principal or the parents and more attempts by the teacher to deal with the problem student personally. There is also more mention of strategies designed to help the student diffuse anger (humor/tension release, changing the social environment, catharsis). Once again, few teachers mentioned failure to respond at all, indirect behavior modification or shaping strategies, or strategies designed to improve Ron's self-concept.

The data in Section G indicate that 11 teachers did not mention behavioral change demands made on Ron, and 41 mentioned such demands but offered no rationales or justifications for them. Of the 45 who included rationales or justifications, the majority would cite rules against fighting (17) or try to persuade Ron that his behavior was self-defeating (14). Moralizing (8) and trying to induce empathy (9) were mentioned less frequently as responses to Ron than they had been mentioned as responses to Tom, whereas logical appeals and especially appeals to rules were mentioned more often. Perhaps moralizing/berating and Golden Rule/empathy appeals are "low level" approaches that teachers use primarily with students whom they see as seriously deficient in moral development and tending toward delinquency or

criminality (recall that Tom stole Sam's lunch money in addition to beating him up) whereas other appeals are used more with students seen as able to distinguish right from wrong. In any case, many teachers who responded to Tom as if he could not distinguish right from wrong nevertheless responded to Ron as if he clearly understood that aggression was wrong but needed help in learning to control his temper.

All but nine teachers reported some attempt to socialize Ron (Section I). About half would punish Ron personally or refer him to the principal or the parents for punishment. In addition or instead, 31 would provide instruction in better coping skills, 27 would moralize or lecture, 17 would urge him to come to them in the future for solution of interpersonal conflicts rather than try to solve such conflicts on his own, and 7 would rely on Golden Rule or empathy appeals.

Fewer than half of the teachers mentioned follow-up strategies (Section J). Of these, the only ones mentioned by more than five teachers were trying to teach Ron self-control or coping skills (20) and trying to identify and address unmet needs (11).

The majority of the teachers would talk to both boys in a single conference rather than talking to them separately or talking only to Ron (Section K). Most teachers would take action to see that the incident was settled (Section M), typically by taking charge personally in a private conference with the two boys (43). In addition or instead, 28 would take actions designed to protect Phil from further harassment by Ron and 20 would have the boys talk out their conflict. Only 4 teachers suggested having the boys fight it out.

Data on reported attempts to socialize or instruct Ron (Section N) indicate that 69 teachers mentioned trying to change Ron in some way rather

than merely to control his behavior. The most common resocialization goal was getting Ron to be able to suppress aggressive impulses (61), although 22 teachers mentioned trying to improve his skills for coping with frustration or conflict, 10 mentioned helping him learn to control his temper, and 9 mentioned trying to "reach" him with Golden Rule or empathy appeals.

The Section H data indicate that almost half of the teachers stated that they would suspend judgment and hear both sides before deciding whether Ron was guilty. Also, of the 45 teachers who would assume Ron's guilt, 19 would at least let him tell his story before taking action. Thus, almost half of the teachers stated that they would not jump to conclusions based on what was said about Ron's "track record" of aggression in the vignette. At least initially, these teachers would react to the incident more as a two-sided fight of unknown origin than as an unprovoked beating of an innocent victim. Furthermore, 19 teachers would automatically invoke a classroom rule against fighting that called for punishment of both participants, regardless of who started the fight (Section O).

In summary, the teachers' responses to Ron in Vignette B resembled their responses to Tom in Vignette A in most respects, although in dealing with Ron there was more willingness to suspend judgment and hear both sides before determining guilt or taking action, less informing of the principal or the parents, and mention of a greater variety of strategies designed to resocialize attitudes and beliefs in addition to controlling behavior.

Relationships Between Vignette B Responses and Effectiveness Ratings

For the most part, the correlations with effectiveness ratings for Vignette B follow the same general trends seen for Vignette A, although these trends appear more in negative relationships in the Vignette B data (that is,

in relationships indicating what the lower rated teachers do and the higher rated teachers do not do, rather than in positive relationships describing the higher rated teachers' responses to Ron).

Once again, the data suggest that the lower rated teachers lacked coherent ideas about coping with aggressive behavior. Some apparently doubted their abilities to cope with Ron effectively at all (those who spoke of delegating the problem to another authority or of referring Ron to the principal or the parents for punishment). Others spoke vaguely of addressing Ron's unmet needs, but did not have much to say about how they would go about changing Ron. Their responses often were limited to punishment (either delivered personally or accomplished through informing the parents or referring Ron to the principal--often as an automatic response to fights in the classroom) or to strategies that suggest failure to appreciate the seriousness of Ron's aggression problem (changing seat assignments or making other changes in the social environment as a response to the fight depicted in the vignette).

The lower rated teachers also tended to speak of seeing the boys separately rather than together and talking to Ron first. Many of these teachers apparently wanted to postpone if not avoid having to confront and deal with the aggressive student, hoping that the problem essentially would take care of itself. As one teacher said, after describing first taking role and collecting lunch tokens before speaking to either boy, "Things never seem quite as bad after they've settled down." Such teachers may also have feared that the boys would resume fighting if spoken to together. Thus, generally negative expectations and/or teacher self-efficacy perceptions tended to be associated with these responses.

Instead of viewing Ron as incorrigibly aggressive, the higher rated teachers were more likely to view him as not yet able to control his aggressive impulses because he had not yet learned strategies for doing so. Consequently, these teachers were more confident of their abilities to achieve significant improvements in Ron's behavior, and they tended to emphasize instruction over attempts to control through threat of punishment. A few would rely on negative third-degree methods, but most would use more positive approaches featuring either behavioral change demands backed by logical analysis or personal appeal rationales or attempts to instruct Ron in strategies for controlling his temper or expressing anger in more acceptable ways (e.g., communicating verbally rather than hitting). These strategies fit well with a cognitive behavior modification/strategy training approach to aggression.

The higher rated teachers would try to settle the depicted incident, especially by having the boys talk out their problem. They would not invoke a rule calling for automatic punishment of participants in a classroom fight, and in following up on the incident with Ron, they would stress resocialization and instruction strategies rather than threat or punishment.

The negative relationship with effectiveness ratings for the strategy of changing Ron's social environment was surprising. Most likely, the problem is not with the strategy itself (moving Ron away from Phil or seating him among prosocial peers), but with the fact that teachers who mentioned it often failed to mention other strategies needed to round out a more complete and powerful response to Ron's behavior (in particular, strategies involving instruction or resocialization). By itself, changing the social environment is not a sufficient response to chronic serious aggression.

A significant positive relationship was expected but did not appear for mention of attempts to protect Phil from further aggression by Ron. Apparently, the teachers who were coded for trying to protect Phil (such as by allowing him to leave school a little early so that Ron would not get another chance to beat him up) tended to be among those who would fail to confront Ron about his aggression and to take effective steps to curb it.

Other responses that might have been expected to show significant relationships but did not were emphasis on improving Ron's mental hygiene or coping skills as a general approach to the problem, supportive isolation (separating Ron from his classmates by mutual agreement, as an attempt to help him stay out of trouble rather than as punishment), trying to improve Ron's insight, prescribing or modeling desired behavior, kid gloves treatment of Ron, tension release methods, catharsis, and appeals to Ron's pride or self-concept. Finally, several variables did not occur often enough to allow assessment of their relationship with the principals' ratings: praise or encouragement of Ron, involving the peers or using classroom meetings or Magic Circle activities, building and using a personal relationship with Ron, building Ron's self-concept, or having the boys fight it out. Many of these categories involve problem-solving strategies that appear inappropriate, and most of the others involve strategies that might be effective with problems such as anxiety or inhibition but are not relevant or powerful enough to be effective responses to aggression.

Grade Level and Location Comparisons

Grade-level comparisons in the correlations between teachers' reported strategies and the principals' effectiveness ratings yielded two contradictions. First, supportive isolation correlated positively in the early

grades but negatively in the later grades. This is part of a more general pattern of findings suggesting that changing the student's social environment is more likely to be effective (if at all) in the early grades. Second, speaking to the two boys separately was associated with high ratings in the early grades, but speaking to the boys together was associated with high ratings in the later grades. The reasons for this difference are unknown.

There were also several variables that correlated $\pm$.30 or better in one grade-level subset but only negligibly in the other. These differences were slight elaborations on the general trends reported above rather than indications that one type of response is needed at the early grades but a sharply different type of response is needed at the later grades. Location comparisons yielded no contradictions or noteworthy contrasts.

Comparison of Findings From the Two Vignettes

The findings from Vignettes A and B are more similar than different and therefore suggest similar conclusions regarding effective handling of incidents of aggression between students. Common findings suggest the need to settle the incident (not just to separate the students in order to break up the fight for the moment) and to take action to resocialize the aggressive student or at least pressure him to exert better control over his aggressive impulses.

The teachers tended to view chronic aggression as resulting from traits residing within the students themselves, although they often saw such aggression as resulting at least in part from parental abuse or neglect at home. The teachers had less confidence in their ability to effect significant improvements in the behavior of aggressive students compared to other problem students, and level of confidence displayed in responses to these two

vignettes was one of the more consistent correlates of effectiveness ratings. Responses tended to concentrate on interactions with the aggressors (Tom, Ron) rather than with the victims (Sam, Phil), but mention of actions taken to attend to the well-being of the victims and to ensure that the incident was settled (so that the victims did not have to fear another attack after school or in the near future) was associated with high effectiveness ratings.

The higher rated teachers treated outbreaks of aggression as serious incidents calling for strong responses designed to make it clear that aggression would not be tolerated. Some would confine their response to such forceful limit-setting, but most would also attempt to resocialize aggressive students through counseling or instruction designed to teach them to control themselves more effectively or to express their anger through more acceptable means than by attacking their classmates. In contrast, the lower rated teachers would often try to pass along the problem to someone else by notifying the principal or a parent of the misbehavior with the implication that this person should deal with the student. To the extent that they spoke of taking action themselves, these teachers tended to make vague comments about following up by getting to the bottom of the problem or meeting unmet needs, by giving the student a brief "talking to," or by relying on behavior modification or environmental engineering strategies of limited scope and intensity (offering incentives for improved behavior, changing seat assignments). The latter responses typically involved only brief or vague mention of rewards or physical isolation; they did not include description of systematic procedures for behavioral contracting or for shaping improved behavior through contingent reinforcement and time-out procedures.

There were a few consistent differences in responses to the two vignettes. One was that the teachers in general, and the higher rated

teachers in particular, tended to see Ron's aggression problem as less serious than Tom's, and to feel greater confidence in their ability to effect significant improvements in Ron's behavior. Thus, they were more likely to speak of dealing with Ron themselves and less likely to involve the peers, the parents, or other adults. They were also less likely to interpret Ron's aggression as deliberate or intentional (e.g., premeditated) and more willing to suspend judgment and hear both sides before drawing conclusions about Ron's guilt or responsibility. Most teachers took Vignette A as evidence that Tom had committed premeditated assault and robbery against blameless Sam, but many of these same teachers did not take Vignette B as evidence that Ron had committed a premeditated and unprovoked attack against Phil--they preferred to investigate to find out whether Phil or other students might have provoked Ron.

Two variables in particular illustrate these differences in perceived seriousness of the problem and in causal attributions concerning the behavior of Tom and Ron (Section F). Only 11 teachers mentioned brief management responses as part of their response to Tom, and this strategy had negative correlations with effectiveness ratings. In contrast, 30 teachers mentioned brief management responses for coping with Ron, and the variable did not correlate significantly with effectiveness ratings. Similarly, suspending judgment before drawing conclusions about guilt or responsibility was mentioned by only 17 teachers in response to Tom but by 41 teachers in response to Ron (Section H). Remarkably, none of the 23 teachers rated high by both the principals and the observers mentioned suspending judgment of Tom, but 65% of these teachers did so for Ron.

The teachers also reported a greater number and variety of strategies for resocializing and controlling the behavior of Ron than of Tom. In addition to

more brief management responses, there was more mention of time out and physical isolation, logical and personal appeals, catharsis, and instruction in acceptable ways of expressing aggression. In short, Ron was seen more as a boy with a temper problem who needed help in learning to control his aggressive impulses, whereas Tom was seen more as an incipient criminal who needed to be controlled through vigilance and punishment.

Although the teachers generally saw Ron's problem as less serious than Tom's, Ron's aggression was described as occurring in the classroom right in front of the teacher, whereas Tom's aggression was depicted as having occurred outside of the school and having been completed by the time the teacher heard about it. This difference in "immediacy" led to responses to Ron that were more negative in certain respects than the responses to Tom. In particular, the teachers were more likely to mention physically punishing Ron (or at least deliberately treating him roughly when breaking up the fight) and subjecting him to a severe scolding that involved personal criticism or extended moralistic lecturing.

Qualitative Impressions

Reading and reflection on the teachers' vignette and interview responses suggest the following qualitative impressions that go beyond the quantitative data shown in the tables. First, many teachers appeared to minimize the seriousness of aggression, given that it is a well-documented indicator of severe current (and probable future) personal and behavioral maladjustment. This was especially true in the early grades in Small City, where some teachers had trouble accepting the notion of an unambiguously blameworthy bully who picks on weaker victims without legitimate provocation. In explaining why they would reserve judgment about what happened between Ron and

Phil, for example, many teachers mentioned that boys who frequently get in fights are often baited by their peers or blamed for things that they did not do. Those who were willing to reserve judgment about Tom also tended to mention that once students get a bad reputation they are likely to be blamed for things that they did not do.

Among teachers who suggested the generally sound notion of holding conferences to investigate and try to resolve aggressive incidents, some appeared unlikely to be very effective because of misguided notions about what to do during such conferences or vulnerability to manipulation by aggressive students. For example, the empathy approach ("How would you feel if someone did that to you?") is largely wasted following incidents of unprovoked bullying or extortion, because the aggressor already knows that the behavior is wrong (although there may be some positive effect if the teacher follows through to the point of making the aggressor see the extent to which his behavior hurts the victim and makes not only the victim, but most onlookers as well, see him as an evil person). Similarly, when one-way bullying gets interpreted as two-way fighting, asking the bully why he did what he did and encouraging him to discuss his motivations at length may invite rationalizations (e.g., false claims of provocation by the victim) and reinforce paranoia.

For some teachers, getting Tom or Ron to own up to his misbehavior was treated as an end in itself (sometimes the only one--the incident would be closed when this admission occurred). In Tom's case, such teachers would tend to "keep the incident in class" if he admitted his guilt and appeared contrite, but would notify the principal or the parents otherwise.

Despite our wording of Vignette B, some teachers viewed the incident as a two-way fight and spoke of holding Phil just as responsible as Ron, such as by demanding that the boys reach agreement about what happened or prescribing equal punishment for both. Or, the teacher might punish Ron more severely but still punish Phil too, on the grounds that he was fighting too. In effect, such teachers substituted a rigid "no fighting" rule for a more responsible (but time-consuming and risky) strategy of finding out what happened and punishing only the guilty.

Attempts to resocialize hostile-aggressive students, if mentioned at all, often were too brief and focused on "We don't do that at school" rather than on where the student's life is headed if his aggressive behavior continues. For example, many teachers were aware of the potential value of talking about feelings and asking students why they behave as they do, but did not seem to be aware of the distinction between legitimate feelings (frustration, disappointment, justified anger) and illegitimate feelings (anger that is either completely unjustified or exaggerated far beyond what would be proportional to the provocation). Such teachers often spoke of making comments that appeared more likely to reinforce aggressive students' tendencies to externalize blame and deny responsibility for their inappropriate behavior than to help them to develop more accurate, less defensive perceptions.

Similarly, although most teachers were clear about the distinction between legitimate and illegimate ways of acting on legitimate feelings, few reported saying much to aggressive students about how aggression isolates one from one's peers, makes one unpopular, and so forth, or about how society will not tolerate aggressive behavior and requires people to learn to solve conflicts nonviolently. Also, it appeared that many teachers could be easily

distracted or confused by rationalizations such as "I was just playing with him" and that many would become so caught up in trying to get the facts that arguing about who did what to whom would take precedence over attempts to socialize the aggressive student. Few teachers spoke of making strong, heartfelt attempts to get through to aggressive students by noting that their aggression is a serious symptom indicating the need for radical change in behavior and for examination of what is happening in their lives that predisposes them to act this way.

Many teachers spoke of trying to teach (or elicit from) aggressive students ideas about other ways of handling conflict situations (walking away, taking out their anger on substitute objects), but few spoke of training students to solve the conflicts through verbal assertiveness and negotiation of mutually agreeable problem definitions and solutions. In effect, the hostile students often were being instructed to stifle their anger and remain frustrated rather than to learn to solve their problems. Teachers who mentioned behavior modification or contract approaches often left out the same essential step: The contracts would focus on reducing the frequency of aggressive incidents but would not include instruction in ways to avoid or resolve such incidents.

Many teachers spoke of trying to keep aggressive students busy, seating them away from peers (and preferably near the teacher where they could be monitored closely). Others spoke of seating them with the rest of the class but among friends (if they have friends) or among nonaggressive peers who are unafraid of them and able to respond to their provocations effectively. These strategies are probably helpful, although they seem less important than other strategies that involve more direct attempts to reduce propensities toward hostility and aggression.

General Discussion

The findings suggest several conclusions about the range and effectiveness of teachers' attempts to cope with hostile-aggressive students. First, the data underscore the fact that, unlike mental health professionals who can work individually with aggressive students and concentrate on trying to understand and help them, teachers must maintain classroom control and protect peers from being harmed by such students. Thus, comparisons of the findings reported here with the advice given to teachers by writers such as Dreikurs (1968) or Gordon (1974) based on individual psychotherapy techniques, or even with the responses of these same teachers when interviewed about other types of problem student that do not threaten classroom order or endanger their peers, suggest that, in addition to trying to understand and help aggressive students, teachers need to be firm and assertive in setting and if necessary enforcing limits against continued aggression. Neither schools as institutions nor teachers as individual professionals can accomplish their intended functions when aggression is a continuing problem, so their first order of business in responding to aggression is to put a stop to it.

The vignette data and especially the interview data tend to favor the views of social learning theorists such as Patterson (1982) over those of psychoanalytic or self-concept theorists concerning the nature and causes of aggressive behavior. Concerning effective responses to such behavior, the data tend to favor the suggestions of writers such as Glasser (1977), Good and Brophy (1987), or Roedell, Slaby, and Robinson (1976) who stress resocialization and self-control training over the suggestions of writers who favor less direct methods (nondirective therapy and environmental engineering strategies that do not include confronting aggressive students about their behavior,

requiring them to accept responsibility and the attendant consequences for it, or instructing them in better ways of coping with conflict and expressing anger).

The lower rated teachers had limited and mostly vague ideas about how to respond to aggressive students. A few of them would try to deny any responsibility for coping with such students, but most would involve the principal or other professionals at the school because they consciously saw themselves as lacking needed ability or training or because they lacked clear ideas about what to do beyond scolding, threatening or invoking punishment, or informing the parents. These teachers were not ineffective because they relied on well articulated but ineffective methods (such as catharsis or physical punishment, for example); instead, they were ineffective because they lacked well articulated ideas about how to cope with aggressive students and thus ended up responding in ways that were not systematic or powerful enough to be effective.

Almost all of the teachers would at least make statements proscribing aggressive behavior and warning against its repetition. For many of the lower rated teachers, this was confined to a brief "talking to." In contrast, the higher rated teachers outlined more intensive and sustained responses. For some, this meant a severe lecture (sometimes an extended scolding or tirade) designed to make it clear that aggression was inappropriate and would not be tolerated. More typically, the higher rated teachers responded with equally determined but less emotionally intense socialization that included logical (i.e., not just moralistic) rationales for behavior change demands and attempts to counsel or instruct the student in more acceptable ways of dealing with frustration and conflict in addition to attempts to coerce him into

stifling his aggressive impulses. (See appendix for selected excerpts from the transcripts.)

Thus, the responses of the higher rated teachers tended to be both power assertive and instructive and to be framed within the context of these teachers' confidence in their ability to change the student and determination to do so. In contrast, the responses of the low rated teachers were mostly coercive but not instructive and amounted to confused attempts to try to control the behavior of aggressive students rather than systematic attempts to change them in more fundamental ways.

Given that aggression is not merely disruptive but involves physical harm to other students, it is appropriate that teachers take coercive action to curb it (e.g., by informing the principal or parents or by threatening or applying punishment). Most of the teachers did mention one or more coercive strategies, especially in response to the vignettes, which (unlike the interview) confronted them with specific incidents of aggression. It is worth noting, however, that the vast majority of the teachers stressed strategies for using threat of punishment to pressure aggressive students into controlling their misconduct rather than using physical punishment or other coercive responses that could be described more as revenge mechanisms or predispositions to inflict punishment for its own sake than as strategies for controlling students who failed to control themselves. This was especially the case for the higher rated teachers, who tended to mention threat of punishment as part of a larger and systematic approach to curbing aggression and resocializing the aggressive student. Lower rated teachers often placed too much emphasis on punishment as retribution and not enough on behavioral change.

Thus, the key to the effectiveness of the coercive aspects of response to aggression was not retribution or even "getting tough" for its own sake. Intead it was the construction of a response that would bring sufficient pressure on the aggressive student to cause him to curb his behavior. Effective teachers were assertive and controlling rather than punitive but ineffectual.

The key to the effectiveness of the instructive aspects of responses to aggressive students appeared to be providing these students with counseling or instruction in more effective ways of handling frustration, controlling their temper, solving conflicts through communication and negotiation rather than aggression, and expressing anger verbally rather than physically. Thus, the higher rated teachers tended to respond to aggression as a behavioral problem calling for resocialization of the student's cognitive and behavioral responses to situations in which he was presently acting aggressively. They did not treat aggression as if it were a neurotic symptom calling for non-directive counseling or self-concept support; nor did they treat it as a relatively minor problem that could be handled through brief management responses, environmental engineering, or behavioral shaping using incentives or contracts (although many higher rated teachers mentioned such strategies as parts of more general approaches that also included actions taken to curb aggression and resocialize the aggressive student).

Although they were firm in demanding that aggressive students curb their aggressive behavior, the higher rated teachers often were protective of these students as well. Besides speaking of taking the time to instruct these students in temper control and better ways of handling conflict, the higher rated teachers were willing to let them tell their story before taking

disciplinary action in conflict situations. These teachers were not likely to encourage angry students to achieve catharsis by acting out their anger physically against substitute objects, however. This study provided no evidence to suggest that the catharsis approach is effective.

Several strategies that are commonly recommended to teachers as methods of responding to problem students were not mentioned often in the teachers' responses to the interview and vignettes dealing with hostile-aggressive students and did not have consistent significant correlations with effectiveness ratings. These include insight-oriented counseling, behavioral shaping through incentives or contracts, extinction through ignoring or time-out procedures, and providing encouragement to the student by developing a close personal relationship and supplying self-concept support. These approaches appear to be too limited or indirect to be effective against chronic aggression, although they might be effective for less serious misconduct problems or for symptoms that are more neurotic than behavioral.

Class meetings, Magic Circle activities, and related group meetings techniques also were not mentioned often and did not correlate significantly with effectiveness ratings, even though these techniques do appear to be appropriate as responses to aggression. They were mentioned often enough to allow a significant relationship with effectiveness ratings to appear if it existed, however, so that the lack of support in the data is due to a lack of consistent relationship with outcome measures and not merely to infrequent mention. The same is true of seeking the problem student's input concerning the nature of the problem or suggestions about solving it. Thus, the data indicate that most teachers either do not know about such techniques or do not find them useful or worth the trouble and that the teachers who do use the

techniques do not consistently achieve better results than other teachers (either because the techniques themselves are not especially effective or because the teachers who use them are not using them in ways that their proponents envision them being used).

Underlying the differences between the higher rated and the lower rated teachers in strategies mentioned was a pervasive difference in their sense of efficacy or confidence in ability to change aggressive students. The lower rated teachers often implied or even stated that they were powerless to change such students, but the higher rated teachers usually expected to achieve significant improvement through their personal efforts. Their rosier expectations often even included a degree of perceptual distortion--in responding to the vignettes, many of these teachers spoke about Tom or Ron as if their aggressive behavior were less chronic or severe than it had actually been portrayed in the vignette. Up to a point at least, these distortions of objective reality in the direction of optimism and positive expectations are probably adaptive because they cut the problem down to "doable" size and allow the teachers to undertake with confidence projects that they might undertake only half-heartedly or not at all if they dwelled on the odds against them. In other words, self-fulfilling prophecy effects of teacher expectations are probably operating here (in addition to effects operating in the opposite direction--it is to be expected that teachers who are more effective in coping with problem students will view a given problem as less severe and feel greater confidence in being able to cope with it successfully than teachers with smaller skill repertoires and less successful track records).

The same general principles for effective response to aggressive behavior appeared to hold in both the early and the later grade levels and in both

Small City and inner-city Big City. However, there were some differences in emphasis. In particular, teachers in the early grades, especially in Small City, could use relatively weak or indirect strategies (brief management responses, minimal interventions, environmental engineering) in addition to and to some extent instead of the more direct and powerful interventions that were needed in the upper grades. In Small City, where teachers tended to encounter less frequent and severe forms of aggression, positive correlations with effectiveness ratings were seen for various supportive or protective strategies mentioned in addition to strategies involving coercion or resocialization of the problem student. These supportive or protective strategies were less likely to correlate positively with effectiveness ratings in Big City, where the most consistent correlates were those suggesting the importance of taking strong and effective action to curb aggressive behavior. This was especially the case for Vignette A in which robbery of Sam's lunch money by Tom suggested incipient criminality ("protection racket" activities), in addition to physical aggression as such. Involving the parents (in positive ways, not just informing them with the intention of motivating them to punish their child) also was correlated more closely with effectiveness ratings in Big City than in Small City. Thus, the Big City data suggest the importance of two factors--school safety and parental involvement--that also have been mentioned frequently as factors that enhance the effectiveness of schools located in inner-city neighborhoods.

Conclusion

One cannot directly infer policy guidelines from these data (and could not even if they were experimental rather than correlational) because one must consider the teacher within the context of the school milieu, especially the

school discipline code and the respective roles that the principal and the teachers are expected to play in enforcing it. In many schools (especially junior high and high schools, which were not addressed in this study), teachers are expected to report incidents of serious aggression to the office for disciplinary action. Furthermore, one could argue that teachers who possess only vague and poorly organized ideas for responding to aggressive students should always refer such students to the principal or to school-based mental health professionals rather than try to handle them personally. Thus, our findings should not be taken as evidence that the responsibility for handling aggressive students should rest primarily with individual teachers or that such teachers should not involve the principal or school-based mental health professionals in developing comprehensive responses to such students.

Nonetheless, there is reason to believe that continuing problems that manifest themselves in the classroom must be dealt with at the classroom level, at least in part, if the goal is to develop a true solution to the problem rather than merely to inhibit the frequency of misconduct by applying sanctions. We believe that schools should attempt to achieve such genuine solutions to students' chronic personal and behavioral problems and therefore that teachers should take an active part in this enterprise (perhaps involving the principal or school-based mental health professionals as well, but not simply turning the problem over to them without maintaining continuing involvement and a sense of responsibility to work toward solution). At least to the extent that it is possible for them to divert time and energy from their primary instructional goals to work on student socialization goals, we believe that teachers who possess effective student socialization strategies should use them and that other teachers should develop them.

As far as they go, the data provide support for strategy training, cognitive behavior modification, and related approaches that call for providing information and instruction to aggressive students that will increase their metacognitive awareness of their thoughts and actions in interpersonal conflict situations and enable them to exert better cognitive control over their behavior. None of the teachers mentioned these techniques or their proponents by name, and none supplied a complete, integrated, and sequenced description of the application of such techniques. However, those elements of the responses of highly rated teachers that involved instruction or resocialization of aggressive students flowed from the same basic ideas that underlie strategy training and cognitive behavior modification techniques, even though the teachers were speaking from experience-based intuition rather than codified knowledge. Along with the general pattern of findings reviewed here, this fact suggests that (a) strategy training and cognitive behavior modification techniques (along with whatever coercive techniques may be necessary to curb aggressive behavior) appear to be more promising than either traditional reinforcement-oriented behavior modification techniques or counseling techniques developed by psychotherapists working primarily with neurotic problems as strategies for teachers to use with hostile-aggressive students; and (b) given that highly rated teachers appeared to be already achieving some success using methods that flow from the same basic ideas, teachers should be especially amenable to training in these techniques and should find them more effective with hostile-aggressive behavior and more feasible for use in the classroom than the more traditionally recommended reinforcement or psychotherapy techniques.

References

Bandura, A. (1973). Aggression: A social learning analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Berkowitz, L. (1973). Control of aggression. In B. Caldwell & H. Ricciuti (Eds.), Review of Child Development Research (Vol. 3, pp. 95-140). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Brookover, W., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J., & Wisenbaker, J. (1979). School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference. New York: Praeger.

Brophy, J. (1983). Classroom organization and management. Elementary School Journal, 83, 265-285.

Brophy, J. (1985). Classroom management as instruction: Socializing self-guidance in students. Theory Into Practice, 24, 233-240.

Brophy, J., & Rohrkemper, M. (in press). The Classroom Strategy Study: Summary report of general findings (Research Series No. 187). East Lansing: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.

Camp, B., Blom, G., Herbert, F., & VanDoorninck, W. (1977). "Think aloud": A program for developing self-control in young aggressive boys. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 5, 157-168.

Dodge, K., & Frame, C. (1982). Social cognitive biases and deficits in aggressive boys. Child Development, 53, 620-635.

Dodge, K., Murphy, R., & Buchsbaum, K. (1984). The assessment of intention-cue detection skills in children: Implications for developmental psychopathology. Child Development, 55, 163-173.

Dodge, K., Pettit, G., McClaskey, C., & Brown, M. (1986). Social competence in children. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Develpment, 57 (2, Serial No. 213).

Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed., pp. 392-431). New York: Macmillan.

Dreikurs, R. (1968). Psychology in the classroom (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Gumer, E., & Aussiker, A. (1987, April). School and classroom discipline programs: How well do they work? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Ericsson, K.A., & Simon, H.A. (1980). Verbal reports as data. Psychological Review, 87, 215-251.

Glasser, W. (1969). Schools without failure. New York: Harper & Row.

Glasser, W. (1977). Ten steps to good discipline. Today's Education, 66 (4), 61-63.

Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1986a). Educational psychology: A realistic approach (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1986b). School effects. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1987). Looking in classrooms (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Goodwin, S.E., & Mahoney, M.J. (1975). Modification of aggression through modeling: An experimental probe. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychology, 6, 200-202.

Gordon, T. (1974). T.E.T. Teacher Effectiveness Training. New York: McKay.

Herbert, M. (1978). Conduct disorders of childhood and adolescence: A behavioural approach to assessment and treatment. Chichester, England: Wiley.

Kennedy, R. (1982). Cognitive-behavioral approaches to the modification of aggressive children. School Psychology Review, 11, 47-55.

Kettlewell, P., & Kausch, D. (1983). The generalization of the effects of a cognitive-behavioral treatment program for aggressive children. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 11, 101-114.

Loeber, R. (1982). The stability of antisocial and delinquent child behavior: A review. Child Development, 53, 1431-1446.

McCuller, C., & Moseby, L. (1983). Disruptive and nondisruptive student perceptions of videotaped classroom situations (R & D Report No. 8007). Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Meichenbaum, D. (1977). Cognitive-behavior modification. New York: Plenum.

Millon, T. (1981). Disorders of personality. New York: Wiley.

Nisbett, R.E., & Wilson, T.D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. Psychological Review, 84, 231-259.

Novaco, R. (1975). Anger control: The development and evaluation of an experimental treatment. Lexington, MA: Heath.

O'Leary, K., & O'Leary, S. (Eds.). (1977). Classroom management: The successful use of behavior modification (2nd ed.). New York: Pergamon.

Olweus, D. (1979). Stability of aggressive reaction patterns in males. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 852-875.

Patterson, G. (1982). Coercive family process. Social Learning Approach Series (Vol. 3). Eugene, OR: Castalia.

Patterson, G., Littman, R., & Bricker, W. (1967). Assertive behavior in young children: A step toward a theory of aggression. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 32 (5, Serial No. 113).

Redl. F., & Wineman, D. (1951). Children who hate. New York: Free Press.

Robin, A., Schneider, M., & Dolnick, M. (1976). The turtle technique: An extended case study of self control in the classroom. Psychology in the Schools, 13, 449-453.

Robins, L. (1966). Deviant children grow up. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.

Roedell, W., Slaby, R., & Robinson, H. (1976). Social development in young children: A report for teachers. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Ross, A. (1981). Child behavior therapy: Principles, procedures, and empirical basis. New York: Wiley.

Schloss, P. (1983). An integrated social learning approach to the treatment of aggressive reactions. Education, 104, 104-112.

Shavelson, R., & Stern, P. (1981). Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgments, decisions, and behavior. Review of Educational Research, 51, 455-498.

Spivack, G., & Shure, M. (1974). Social adjustment of young children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stewart, M., & Ashby, H. (1981). Treatment of hyperactive, aggressive, and antisocial children. In T. Kratochwill (Ed.), Advances in social psychology (Vol. 1, pp. 307-327). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Urbain, E., & Kendall, P. (1980). Review of social-cognitive problem-solving interventions with children. Psychological Bulletin, 88, 109-143.

Zahavi, S., & Asher, S. (1978). The effect of verbal instructions on preschool children's aggressive behavior. Journal of School Psychology, 16, 146-153.

Appendix

Selected Excerpts From the Transcripts

This appendix contains excerpts from the raw data (e.g., the transcripts of the teachers' interview and vignette responses), selected to show representative examples of various beliefs and coping strategies. The emphasis is on the apparently more effective responses made by the higher rated teachers, although typical examples of apparently less effective responses are also included to facilitate comparisons. (Purely punitive, bizarre, or otherwise obviously inappropriate responses have been omitted.)

I. Interview Responses

The following are excerpts from the interview responses of two of the higher rated teachers. They are among the most comprehensive responses made by any of the teachers concerning strategies for coping with hostile-aggressive students.

Example A

The first thing I would probably do would be to talk to the parents. Possibly I would look at the child's cumulative record file first and see how long this kind of behavior has been going on. If it has been something that has continued and I see that there has been a social worker or counselor involved, I would probably continue those kinds of services or talk to those people. But if it is something that has just begun, I would talk to the parent and try to find out the causes for it. I think it's especially important that the child realizes what kind of limitations are set up on him in the classroom. And I would want to see, therefore, what kind of limitations are set at home. If there is control by the parents, how the parent rewards or punishes the child when they do these particular things or if it's just something that has been going on at school. So, first of all, I'm going to try to find the causes. One thing I think is very important with these children is that they are able to express their hostility somehow. They've got to be able to work this out and if I can get them to express why they feel so angry, and not condemn what they're saying, not say that this is wrong but just listen, be a sounding board for them. And have a conference and give no reward or punishment at that time but simply just be a time where they can express their feelings to me on a confidential basis. Then I would certainly try to promote, as I do with any child in the classroom, an atmosphere of friendliness and acceptance--that I'm not happy with the particular type of behavior but it doesn't make me like the child less. As I said before, I think it's very important that they know definitely what they are expected to do in the class. I would explain this to the whole class, but also, if I needed to in conference, talk about the rights of other people. People have a right to come to school and be in a class without feeling threatened, without feeling intimidated or without having someone put their hands on them. I think this is very important that they understand that they have certain rights and that other children in the class have certain rights, and that they should not infringe upon their rights and why. I think in doing all this that their drive or their feeling of finding themselves and where they fit in need not be blocked, that you've got to get some kind of a release for these kinds of intense behaviors and sometimes I think it's good to work it out. For instance, I talked about verbally trying to express their

feelings. Now this is hard sometimes when an act takes place. You almost have to do it at a time when the teacher can just give her undivided attention to the child. Possibly after school, or if an aide is in the classroom, you can take the child out right at that particular time and talk to them so that they can get calmed down, get quieted down. I think sometimes it's necessary to simply remove the child. One thing that I have done in the past is have a time-out (either a place or a box) in the room. For instance, in this room there's this area where a child can get away from the group, can get away from the problem and go to that area and be alone. Think about it. But just to move them out of the situation. I think so many times there doesn't need to be any punishment or condemning. It's simply to stop what is going on. I think that this is the important thing. And things get back to normal much quicker if you just remove the child from the situation. Say, "We don't hit children in this room," and remove the child and put them in a place by themselves. Sometimes I'll ask these children if they just want to go out in the hall and collect themselves or if they would like to go down to the office. So that they are not humiliated in front of the class, so that they don't see those angry feelings or maybe they break down and cry after something has happened. It's important that they can just have a time by themselves. And usually when they walk back into the classroom, nobody says anything to them. They've gotten themselves under control and they just are a part of the class and I don't say anything more. Usually at that time everything has been resolved. I have talked to them or we set a time to talk after school. But the important thing is to get them to express their impulses in an accepted way and this is why it is necessary to work with them. One film that I just showed recently was a film from the Inside-Out series called Bully. It's about a child who is always picking on other children. When I showed this film I could see just from watching the children that they all felt much toward the child who was being picked on. You could see some of them even clench their fists and they were ready to take on this bully. We had quite a discussion about understanding feelings that each child has. That the bully had feelings of violence and sometimes they were very fearful and took it out on other people. I think as you work with a child like this you can see when these flare-ups are going to happen. Possibly in the gym, poor sportsmanship where they get very angry if they don't have their way or if someone says they're caught and they won't admit it. Very often I will just simply remove them from the game and just say, "Stand over here until you have calmed down and you can accept it and go back and play, keep your anger under control, play by the rules." And I give them that choice, either you can go back and play, keep your anger under control, play by the rules or you can stand over here by the side and watch the game. This often works just fine; they calm down very easily and go back into the game. Now sometimes that anger erupts again and I say, "Now you've made your choice, now you come over and stand." There is no argument about it as far as I'm concerned. Another thing that helps this type of child is to role-play situations. This might be a part of working with a film such as Bully, carrying it on a little further. Having the class act out situations where a child is hostile and how they would handle it. What they think the child who has these feelings should do, how they think the other child should handle it. And sometimes, also, when a hostile child is out of the room, I would talk to the other children about how this person behaves and about some of the ways that we could help him to not get angry, what are the ways to relate or respond to these people so we can help them.

Example B

My first strategy is to find out what caused the problem. If I am able to identify it, it would be through parent conferences or telephone calls to the parent. In other words, close contact with the home. Sometimes the teacher can identify quite easily after talking to the parents what is going wrong at home. Sometimes it is beyond the help of the teacher or the parents--it could be a crisis situation--but lots of times it is an ongoing thing that the parents unknowingly are doing or not doing that causes this sort of behavior. You will often have parents say, "Yes, we have this at home, what would you recommend?" At this point, you have an opportunity to give some good suggestions that might reduce this sort of behavior. My own experience indicates that it can be minimized greatly within the classroom through strategies that the teacher uses. If you find out that there has been too strong discipline in the home, too violent or whatever, you certainly don't want to repeat those mistakes at school. You have to study the child quite carefully, observe when he becomes threatening or hostile, what sort of things provoke him, and steer around those or avoid them if possible. When he does break a rule or injure another child or whatever, you have to be very careful in how you approach any so-called punishment. One strategy that works well is to take the student outside the room and sit down with him on a one-to-one basis and talk to him about his behavior. Try to be completely nonthreatening so that he will open up and perhaps express some resentments or feelings that he has. I always ask if it is something here at school first and try to get them to feel so nonthreatened that they will be honest about their feelings. If it is nothing that I can control here, then I try to help them deal with the situation at home. Perhaps they can't change, in most cases they can't, but I can at least help them to learn how to deal with it. I think one of the major problems that a teacher has today is to deal with hostility and to teach children how to deal with their own angers and hostilities in a nonthreatening way, nonaggressive manner. This behavior can be greatly minimized by teacher modeling and teacher interaction not only with the student involved, but with the rest of the class, perhaps when that student is absent. Sometimes after repeated incidents, one has to take action of a punitive sort and I feel that in the case of property damage a child should be made to pay for at least part of the damage he has caused even if he makes a small contribution by earning money at home, by maybe working here at school. If he has injured another child, I ask him to think about whether an apology is due. I do not say whether he has to apologize. I ask him to think about it. In a rare occasion, I have him call the parents of the child who has been injured and explain what he has done. This is a very difficult thing for a child to do, but I think it teaches a lasting lesson. I often have him call his own parents with me standing by, and tell them that he is in the office and why he is in the office, and what he has done. I think as often as possible, have the child deal with the problem directly, taking the responsibility for his own actions. So many of these students have never seen a relationship of cause and effect when it comes to lashing out at people through poorly controlled tempers, this sort of thing. I think the sooner they can take responsibility for their own actions, the better they will be able to progress both in and out of school.

II. Vignette Responses

A. Examples of Teachers' Theories of Aggression

1. Aggression as innate, stable: I would say his behavior describes someone that, even though I'd written the note home to the mother, I wouldn't get much cooperation because I don't think he would follow home rules either. By the time he's reached the sixth grade I don't think his parents are strong enough to handle him. If he can't be handled in school by the time he reaches sixth grade then his home life has been the same way.

2. Displaced anger/catharsis: I think sometimes children who are just really physically aggressive don't really understand why they are doing it. It's like an impulse and it comes. They might be angry about something totally unrelated to the child they are hitting. It's like the nearest available person gets the aggression. . . . I guess my goal would be to try and help Ron get a handle on himself and that when he starts feeling really angry and aggressive inside, rather than taking it out on someone else, perhaps he could come and talk to me and I could tell him to go run around the playground three times. Just some way to get it out (tell him that we all have angry feelings, we all feel like hitting somebody at some point and it's just a matter of whether you act on it or not. That the feelings that he has aren't wrong, but that he could deal with them in a better way. . . . Maybe he could throw a ball against the wall as hard as he can. That sort of thing. Just redirect him.

3. Aggression as compensatory: It sounds like maybe he's insecure in some ways and he takes his frustrations out by picking on the other kids. It doesn't tell you, does he have money of his own? A lot of times, a kid that bullies other kids is maybe using size to make up for other things that he is lacking. Maybe he doesn't do well at school. Maybe he doesn't have any friends and he is taking it out on other kids because of that. I certainly think he would be a frustrated child.

4. Modeling: Ron is definitely a child who has never learned to cope with society except by hitting and fighting. . . . If he is a child of the street this is typical behavior because this is the way they do things for survival. They fight. This is part of their life. It kind of depends on what has happened, why they are fighting. They may do this at home, the parents may fight all the time. This might be the way you take care of all of your problems. Physical fighting. Dad might beat mother up and so on.

5. Psychodynamic view of modeling: Work with Tom on a daily basis to minimize the feeling of power that he gets from bullying other students. . . . In my estimation Tom has received some overpowering dominance at home from a parent or perhaps older brother or sister and because he is so dominated at home he feels the need for dominance at school and he would probably pick a student who is somewhat weak and who he feels could be a natural prey.

6. Cognitive deficit: Ron is an example of his actions getting ahead of his brains. It's poor judgment about what to do to solve a problem. If he had thought about it for a minute he wouldn't have done it probably.

B. Examples of Teachers Treating Aggression as Less Serious Than It Had Been Portrayed in the Vignettes

1. I don't think anyone is a bully at heart. There's usually something that provokes it. . . . I characterize this as a boy that probably is in trouble a lot and probably Ron gets blamed for lots of things that he doesn't do because it's easy to blame him. He gets tired of it so he probably gets made fun of and probably gets laughed at when he gets in trouble and he is retaliating, that this is the only way he's trying to say, "I'm not always to blame," even though he often is.

2. My goal for Tom would be help him find a way to change his behavior by trying to find out why he feels the need to do this. Make him think more positively of himself. . . . If he can get satisfaction out of a good relationship, he wouldn't resort to the bullying activities. . . . I think he is basically kind of insecure. This bullying is kind of a front.

C. Examples of Teachers' General Approaches

1. Authoritarian/direct socialization

a. More effective example:

Assuming I got them separated physically, there is no problem there. . . . "You are sitting there telling me that I don't believe you and all that stuff. I don't. I don't believe a thing, when it comes to a fight, I'm always going to believe the other person. And that's kind of sad. One of these days you are not going to be at fault and you are going to suffer. And you have that reputation and it is up to you to change it." I might try to resolve the problem without going to the principal and getting parents involved and that kind of thing. But we don't fight, that's a major thing and we get this kind of kid. If you haul the parents in, a lot of times the parents are the problem but if they are going to be hauled in and the kid's going to be suspended for a couple of days, this kind of thing, it will settle down. Now that doesn't change the fighting behavior but at least it stops it. And it gives you a chance to spend more time with the kid and I spend a lot of time; we talk about different ways of handling a fighting situation rather than fighting. A lot of times these kids don't have any alternatives to fighting. They have been fighting everything since they have been old enough to walk. And I tell them, "You know, out in adult society there aren't that many people that fight. Very, very rarely. I haven't been in a fight in years and years. There are other ways to handle these kinds of things." If I really get going, I say, "We as adults define the word weak and go in on a person who can't solve problems--that's how I judge weakness, a person who has to fight is weak. I really worry about somebody that has to fight all the time because that's weakness, that isn't strength." Boy, that drives them up a wall. "It takes a lot more of a man to stop and think. . . . I feel sorry for you, the whole world is going to look at you and say, "Look at that guy, isn't he weak."

b. Less effective example:

One of these days, Ron, you might run up on someone who is a little tougher. They may be mild and sit back and seem less aggressive than you are, but you

don't always play that number. . . . You might be a bully, but you might run into a bull one day. You may get what you are asking for." (to interviewer) I'm getting to the bottom of it and I am going to punish him for it. I am going to let him know I don't want this to happen in the classroom again.

c. Less effective example:

Probably the first thing I would do is go over and grab Ron and comfortably put him in his seat and let him know where he belongs and I would tell him that he has disrupted my class and started a fight. Knowing the child will probably want to blame it on the other kid, "As far as I am concerned, Phil is not at fault at all. You had no business being over there--you should have been in your seat. As far as I am concerned you are totally at fault." And I would say, "Even if he did do something to you, you're at fault for not coming and telling me." I would tell him that if he got out of his seat again today he would get his bottom warmed and that I would call his mother and I don't want him to put a hand on anyone else in the room. I would take this attitude because I feel he should have been in his seat. Not so much the fact that he has been in scuffles before but that he has been in the wrong place. He was in the wrong place at the wrong time and that he is wrong for doing that as far as I am concerned. That is the determining factor of guilt regardless of what Phil did to him. I try to stress with the kid that they shouldn't really fight with each other and again the reason why is that fact that he was out of his seat and he should've been in his seat and that is the way I feel about that.

2. Problem solving/decision making

a. More effective example:

Since it is Ron who has left his seat. . . . I would remove him immediately from the room and talk to him and find out the problem. I would say, "Ron, you were out of your seat and hitting Phil. Could you tell me why you were doing it?" and find out his rationale. If he thinks Phil has done something, I would have Phil come out and give his side of it. Make Ron listen. I would not accept anything from Ron. I would let Ron hear Phil, then let Ron talk and let Phil hear Ron to see what could happen. And see if I could learn something that I did not know because it is so easy to jump in and not know all the facts or where the children are coming from. The main thing is to find out what started it, why is he doing this. If it is consistent with Ron doing this and fighting and so on, we would talk, I would begin to talk to Ron about ways he can cope with this rather than fighting and hitting. "What could you do that wouldn't hurt anybody? I know you are feeling angry." So you let the child know how you think he is feeling and that gives him a chance to say, "Yes, I am angry, mad because so and so did so and so." So you do try to have the child understand that you have a feeling of where they are coming from, and how they are feeling and [you] accept it. But how could they cope with it in another way. You are going to have to start working with Ron if this is a consistent thing. To stop it right then and there you would remove him from the room and find out why. . . We are going to start exploring ways [of dealing with feelings].

b. Less effective example:

I would take the two people involved and talk with them separately, and hear what each had to say. I couldn't totally ignore it, but just because he's a bully it isn't necessarily his fault. You have to hear both sides and then make a decision. There may have been some reason things happened the way they did so I would probably again step out into the hallway and listen to both sides. . . . Someone mentioned to me there was a problem on the way to school this morning, and I thought maybe it would be best for us to talk about it." Listen to one's story and then to the other's story and if they don't agree then we try going step by step. "Do you agree with that step, and do you think that happened?" until the two stories are pretty similar. If it were just as it says here, maybe he really did beat him up, then we would take it a step further, make some more decisions. I would like them to be involved in the decision making process as to how we might resolve this problem. . . . It's hard for me to say (what the right decision/solution would be), because I usually pretty much let them decide what they're comfortable with. If they have decided that they just can't stand each other and they better not be around each other, then if that's what they're comfortable with, then I go along with that. If they think they can work it out with just an apology, then fine. I really wouldn't exercise any kind of punishment because, number one, it really wasn't my problem, it was their problem. The only reason I really took part in it is the fact that it's anger and they can't work in the classroom if they're both still angry. We still would have to find out what happened to the lunch money, obviously, and that would have to be solved in that sense too, to where they're both comfortable.

3. Behavior modification/shaping/reinforcement

a. More effective example:

"Ron, Phil, would you come up here please? Ron, do you want to tell me what happened? Phil. . .? What do you think caused it, Ron? How do you think you could have stopped it? What might you have done for it not to have happened at all?" After they've discussed, and after they've talked about those things, and hopefully get Ron to label his behavior, that he was fighting. And that he did start the fighting, to be able to accept that fact, that, "Yes, I caused it and I was fighting." Goals would be to stop that disruptive behavior, and it might have to be charted. Fighting sounds to me like one that works really well with charting. . . days without fighting. That means, when I have charted it, that means on the way to school, on the bus, in the playground, and at school. If he can get through a whole morning without a fight, he earns a sticker. I never go for 10 out of 10. I usualy go morning and afternoon, cause the whole day is kind of tough to look at. That means that way they get 10 stickers and out of the 10, I try and set 8 as the goal. Eighty percent of the time no fighting. Pretty soon, after about 6 to 8 weeks you usually don't even need the charting, they're up to 8 and 9 every week.

b. Less effective example:

If you know that Phil gets along with other students and Ron starts fights, then you know probably it's Ron's fault. First of all, you try to

separate them because I tell the children the same things. "We don't run because you might slip and hit your head and we don't fight because someone might get hurt." I would first get all the safety precautions out of the way, get them apart, and probably Ron would be the one I would grab. . . . Then, I would take Ron and Phil probably out into the hall. I talk to them both and say, "Phil, what's going on?" and whatever he says, and Ron, whatever he says. Sometimes they lie to me. But generally, it is pretty consistent behavior. If Ron is the one that usually fights, he probably is the one. I tell him this. I would say, "Ron, I'm sorry to say it but I really have to believe Phil because I very seldom have to talk to him but I have to talk to you. What am I to do? I can't be with you all the time. You are the one that's got to behave." I really do try to say "Hey, it's you, it's not me" and I do have to guide them. It's their behavior, it's their life, and I'm not going to be sitting there half the time. So it has to be motivation within themselves. So that is what I would try to talk to Ron about. Maybe even get a little behavior chart going. If he is really, depending on the intensity and continuation, if he has had three bad weeks straight, I might have a little chart for him and put his name on top. If he has a good day, I would put the date on it with a star pocket underneath and if he has a very good day and no fights and really good behavior I would put a star on it. Or, maybe "Ron, you didn't get a star today because you were fighting." This type of thing. I usually keep this on my desk and it doesn't come off of it. Then I talk to him a little later, a week or two, depending on his behavior. Then I ask him, "Do you think you should get a star?" Yes or no. They are very honest. "No, I shouldn't because out on the playground I did this." They usually tell me things I don't even know. Or, I would say, "I think you have been really good, I think you deserve a star."

4. Making the aggressor recognize and accept responsibility for his behavior. Both of the following are more effective examples from higher rated teachers (the less effective examples are purely punitive, "Now you've done it--you're suspended" responses).

Example A:

"Tom, would you like to tell me about what happened on the way to school this morning? Nothing? Well, it seems some of the kids are awfully excited about a discussion that you and Sam had on the way to school. Should we get Sam over here to tell us a little bit about it?" Enter Sam. "Sam says that you hit him and took his lunch money. Do you have his lunch money?" "No." "Can you tell me what happened to Sam's lunch money?" "Got dropped." "You didn't have anything to do with dropping it? What can you think of for Sam to do now? He's got to have money for lunch, and it seems that you were highly involved in the situation. Maybe you and Sam could go and hunt for the money, and perhaps the money would turn up." "What if it doesn't?" "You wouldn't happen to have the money with you? You didn't find it on the way, find it and have it with you? Oh you do, OK. How did the money get in your pocket? Sam dropped it and you picked it up? What would you call this, Tom? I want you to think of a name for what you did. I'm going to come back in about five minutes and ask you for a name." I think that these children often don't

recognize what beating up or bullying is, and I like them to label it themselves, call it by its correct name. This helps them to realize that the behavior isn't good, and to accept that they shouldn't do it. Half the time they don't know that it's really wrong, that it's not something they should be doing. If you show that you don't like that type of behavior, that usually begins to turn them around if they respect you.

Example B:

"Tom, I hear that you had some difficulties on the way to school and I would like to talk to you." I would take him out into the hall. "Tom, I was really sorry to hear that on the way to school that you were beating Sam up and you took his lunch money. I'm going to call Sam out and I would like you to please give him back his money and tell him that you sometimes have a little trouble controlling yourself and you will try not to have this thing happen again. I know that sometimes people have things that you want or sometimes when a person is smaller than you are, to make yourself look good or big, you have to act like this. But, in the long run if you can try to be a little more thoughtful of other people you are going to have more friends. This sort of behavior doesn't help you. It makes other child not want to be around you. Another thing is, if this sort of behavior continues, I'm going to have to call your mother in to discuss it with her. Because if you are having difficulty getting to school and taking care of yourself at the same time, there will have to be some arrangement made so that other children are not intimidated by you."

D. Noteworthy Unique Suggestions

The following suggestions were unique and thus could not be examined for correlations with effectiveness ratings, but appear to be worth noting here.

1. Use the filmstrip "The Boy in the Red Hat" (about a boy who comes to a new school wearing a red hat and thinks that everyone is laughing at him when in fact they are laughing at other things) as a stimulus for discussion of the need to avoid jumping to conclusions about the thoughts or intentions of others.

2. If poverty breeding resentment is part of the problem, work to see that the student gets good clothes, free lunch, or other things he might need.

3. Tell the student that you know there is a "good Tom" because you have seen it, and urge him to "get back to the good Tom."

4. Tell overly punitive parents who encourage the teacher to punish their child physically that you "intend to work on his head rather than his bottom," and that physical punishment is basically ineffective, and that if you start it you end up having to use it every day. Instead, you intend to establish control through firm expectations and determination.

"END OF DOCUMENT"